

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1903.

I.

THE FIRST PRESIDENT OF MARSHALL COLLEGE, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS RAUCH, PH.D.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, D.D.

It was a remarkable ordering of Providence that gave to an infant institution of learning located in the village of Mercersburg in 1835 as its official head and chief teacher a man of such varied powers and rich resources of learning and scholarship. Circumstances over which the Reformed Church, under whose direction Marshall College was founded, had no control, brought the very man whom the College needed from the University of Heidelberg to the shores of America, and brought him at a time when his services were especially in demand, but when no friend of the College anticipated a gift of such high order of excellence from the fatherland.

Frederick Augustus Rauch was the son of a respectable clergyman of the Reformed branch of the Protestant Church of Germany, settled in the vicinity of Frankford on the Maine. Frederick was born July 27, 1806. At the age of eighteen he became a student at the University of Marburg, where he took his diploma in 1827. Then he prosecuted his studies for a year at Giessen. Afterwards he was for a

time employed as assistant teacher in a literary institution in charge of an uncle in Frankford. Then he spent another year as a student at Heidelberg.

This year passed at Heidelberg constituted an epoch in his history as a Christian, a philosopher, and a theologian. Here he came under the special influence of Charles Daub, a man whose qualities of mind and character were adapted to and satisfied the intellectual and moral demands of earnest students who were grappling with the religious and metaphysical problems of that skeptical age. On the relation of Dr. Daub to the development of faith and thought in the life of Rauch the Rev. Dr. John W. Nevin says: "Dr. Rauch always cherished the highest veneration for this great man, and looked back with fond recollection upon the year spent at Heidelberg, under the light of his instructions, and in contact with the living power of his spirit, as in some respects the most interesting and important parts of his education." In the class-room Dr. Rauch made frequent reference to the subject-matter and the method of the teaching of this professor in most commendatory terms, and whenever the occasion arose he would freely express his obligations to his moulding influence.

Two grades of professors distinguish the universities of Germany; both grades are appointed by the government; they are designated by the titles: extraordinary and ordinary. The professor extraordinary is simply a teacher, having no further duties or privileges. The position is valued as a stepping-stone to preferment. In many cases a number of years elapse before he is promoted to an ordinary professorship. Ordinary professors compose the faculty proper, and are entitled to all its privileges. It is complimentary to the character, scholarship and standing of Rauch that he held the position of professor extraordinary in the University of Giessen for only one year. At the end of that time he received an invitation to the University of Heidelberg as ordinary professor. At this point in his career his prospects

were fair, and he had high hopes for the future. Suddenly, however, dark clouds gathered in the sky, and his prospects were shrouded in deep gloom.

In some public exercise at Giessen he uttered his mind too freely on the subject of government, and gave sore offence to the civil authority. The precise point is not known. The whole affair was one to which he never liked to refer, and few among his friends in this country knew that any political difficulty had made it necessary to leave his native land. But whatever it was, it brought upon him the sharp displeasure of the government, and in the opinion of his friends his safety required that he should seek a home in a foreign country. Tradition says that his departure was sudden. He had time to make only a hurried visit to his father between the hours of eleven and one at night; when he bade him a sorrowful adieu, and became an emigrant bound for a new trial of the world in the far-off west. Of the state of mind in which Dr. Rauch exchanged his native land for America Dr. Nevin says: "It was not the love of wandering, nor the visions of romantic fancy, nor any particular zeal he felt for our republican institutions as such, which brought him to exchange Germany for America. He was ardently attached to his fatherland and had every reason to be satisfied there with his circumstances and prospects. It must have been with an immense sacrifice of feeling that he found himself compelled to abandon all, and become a stranger in a foreign land."

Dr. Rauch came to America in the fall of 1831, having completed the twenty-fifth year of his age. By means of letters of introduction he came to Easton, Pa., and received a cordial welcome from the Rev. Thomas Pomp, pastor of the Reformed Church of that place. Soon he became known to the Faculty of Lafayette College as a gentleman and as a scholar of the first order. For nearly a year he applied himself diligently to the cultivation of the English language. His knowledge of music stood him in good stead. In this

art he excelled practically as well as theoretically; and to gain an independent support he did not hesitate to give lessons on the piano. But the necessity of gaining a livelihood by these means did not continue long. During the year he was elected Professor of the German Language in Lafayette College. But he was not allowed to hold this position for any length of time. Meanwhile his presence and his merits had become known to some extent throughout the German Reformed Church; and in the fall of 1832 he was elected principal of the Classical School which previously had been opened at York, Pa., under the auspices of the authorities of the Theological Seminary, then (since 1828) located in that city. About the same time he was chosen professor of Biblical Literature by the Synod of Frederick of the Reformed Church. In this twofold capacity he labored for three years with superior ability and great success.

In 1835 this school was removed to Mercersburg, and converted into a college by a charter obtained from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, under the title of Marshall College. Dr. Rauch was chosen president. He retained the Chair of Biblical Literature, the Seminary being removed with the Classical School from York to Mercersburg. As President of Marshall College and Professor in the Theological Seminary he served the cause of liberal education in the Reformed Church with extraordinary self-denial, diligence and zeal until March, 1841, a period of five years, when it pleased an all-wise Providence to call him to his reward. He died in the thirty-fifth year of his age, just when his intellectual vigor had fully matured, and he was turning his profound scholarship, his manifold erudition and culture to most account in the sphere of philosophy for the kingdom of Christ.

As between the Reformed and Lutheran branches of the Reformation, Dr. Rauch was by birth and early education an adherent of the Reformed faith; and as a consequence when he landed on our shores his spiritual tendencies and affiliations drew him to the church in which he was brought

up. At that time, 1831, the Reformed Church was comparatively small and weak. She had no cheering and hopeful inducements with which to appeal to the mind of a university professor. She had no tempting offer as to dignity of position or comfortable salary to present. She had no school, no institution of learning, to serve which would reflect honor on a man of his ability and educational resources. It may with truth be said that, at that time, there was not a member of this church, in the ministry or among the laity, with perhaps one or two exceptions, who would have been qualified or would have been willing, to be the head of a school of liberal education, such as leading men of the church desired to establish. To this pass the Reformed Church was brought by its unfortunate history. Though organized in 1747, that is, for a period of seventy-eight years (from 1747 to 1825); though an organization independent of the synods of Holland for a period of thirty-two years (from 1793 to 1825), yet, notwithstanding the persevering efforts of some of the most influential men, the synod had not succeeded in opening either a classical school or a school of theology until 1825, when the Rev. Lewis Mayer, D.D., after declining the position several times, finally, in the spring of 1825, consented to take the chair of systematic theology. He began his work without any of the requisite external appliances and resources. There was no endowment fund. There was no building. The school had only a small number of warm supporters, and had as many opponents, it may be said as many enemies, as devoted friends. Dr. Mayer deserves the profound gratitude of the whole Reformed Church for his self-denying venture of faith in resigning the pastorate to accept a call from a theological institution that had an existence in idea and purpose rather than in fact.

When Dr. Rauch was chosen for the second chair of the seminary the institution had been in operation for about seven years; but its financial status had not been much improved. Instruction was given in rented buildings. The

salary of the professors was small. The endowment was entirely inadequate. The payment of the salaries was largely or mainly dependent upon collections in some of the churches. Some pastors, some congregations were indifferent, some hostile, to the educational enterprise. That was a dark day when Dr. Rauch sailed across the Atlantic to become a yoke-fellow with our fathers in the service of a feeble organization, a dark day for our theological school, a dark day for classical learning and philosophical training. Yet dark as was the day, unpropitious as was the obscure beginning of the classical school, Dr. Rauch cast his lot among us, and cheerfully bore the double burden that was laid upon his shoulders. It is not known that he ever lamented the circumstances of his condition, or complained of the discouraging outlook of the infant college. Instead he addressed himself with resolution and unflagging energy to the momentous enterprise he had in hand. Having put his hand to the plough he would not and did not look back.

Dr. Rauch had admirable qualifications for the presidency of Marshall College; but his qualifications were those of scholarship, of culture, and of noble personal character, and to this intellectual and moral sphere of power he devoted his time and strength. Familiar with the classics, conversant with the various systems of philosophy of ancient and modern times, at home in the realm of literature and art, and gifted with a retentive memory, with a lively imagination and a logical mind, his teaching was free as well as profound, rich and manifold in instruction as well as stimulating and inspiring. The financial affairs of the institution he committed to other hands, as he had neither taste nor fitness for that important department of labor in the erection of a college. Nor at that time, nearly three quarters of a century ago, was the collection of funds thought to be a part of the duty of a president of a college, at least not among the people who were especially interested in the growth of the institution over which Rauch presided.

The class-room was the kingdom in which Rauch chiefly exerted his molding power over the unfolding minds of his students. The rostrum was his throne. He taught partly by the use of a text-book; but parallel with questions on the text of the book ran comment, illustration, criticism, supplementation. These informal lectures excited thought, provoked inquiries, and led to profitable discussion on many topics connected with the main question before the class. Rauch taught also by formal lectures on different departments of philosophy, psychology, ethics, esthetics. By means of criticisms and by direct and positive teaching his wealth of learning and his philosophic ideas were developed; gradually he shaped the thinking of his students with a force deeper and greater than they were aware of at the time. Especially was this true of his method of thought, which, so far as they apprehended it, brought them into conflict with the dominant views of their text-books.

Rauch's prevailing method of thought was neither purely analytic nor purely synthetic, but elements of both were united in a genetic method. His analogies and illustrations were drawn from the realm of organized life, and from the growth of a plant rather than from the life of the animal. The process of thought and of teaching was analogous to the development of the oak from the acorn. As the acorn potentially bears in its bosom the type and the law of the full-grown oak, so the central idea of a science or a system of philosophy, whether it be an accepted truth or only an hypothesis, envelops vitally as in a germ the entire content of the system and governs its structure by a law of its own; as the oak is the realization of the vital possibilities slumbering in the undeveloped acorn, so the system, when logically developed, will at all points assert and represent the import and controlling force of the central idea. Philosophic thought is a vital process, not a mechanical product. The universe is an organic whole, not a palace. It has come to be what it is, not by manufacture like a watch, but by a living process, by a process of development under the plastic hand of God.

It may be said that Rauch's thinking was internal, not external; starting from within the object of thought, not from without: vital, not mechanical; ruled by the phenomena of life, not by the properties of a mechanism: necessary, not arbitrary; determined by the constitution of the subject, not by the will of the thinker. The category and law of time was dominant in his philosophic investigations, not the category and law of space. Hence the spontaneous tendencies of his mind were toward the ground or reason of a thing, downward toward what was fundamental, whether in the natural world of reality or in the scientific world of ideas, and upward toward the Author of all things, and onward to the consummation of history. The consequence of his teaching, and especially of his method of teaching, was that his students who were accessible to the transforming and uplifting influence of his mental and moral training became, in proportion to their capacity, thinkers.

By way of illustrating Rauch's constructive ideas in the realm of metaphysical thought I quote a short series of philosophemes communicated to his students in the class-room:

1. "Most of us are in the habit of considering nature and its manifold processes as a mechanical whole, whose parts have been brought together by some mechanic, and whose powers exist side by side, without having any affinity to or connection with each other.

2. "But the opposite of all this is the case. Nature is a system, not a conglomeration; alive and active in all its elements and atoms; it is filled with powers, from the mechanical, chemical, magnetic and galvanic, up to the organic, all of which flow invisibly into each other, affect and determine each other. Eternal laws dwell in them; and provide that while these powers receive and work with and through each other none interferes with the other or in any degree changes its nature, but supports and upholds it. Thus we have a constant life; powers flow up and down, to and fro.

3. "All life, wherever it exists, is formed and organized. Form is not and cannot be the result of matter, which is chaotic and shapeless. Form in man and throughout the universe is the result of thought. Hence life, being formed, does not proceed from matter; but it is a thought of God, accompanied by the divine will, to be realized in nature, and to appear externally by an organized body.

4. "As the thought gives the form, so the divine will, resting in the thought, and inseparably united with it, works as power and law in all nature.

5. "The animal with its members and senses, what else can it be but a divine thought exhibited in an external form.

6. "The soul of man is likewise a divine thought, a creation of God, filled with powers to live an existence of its own. It contains in its simple, identical activity all that appears afterwards, under the form of faculties. They are but the development of the energies of the soul.

7. "Reason has not its origin in itself; its author is God, whose will lives in it as its law.

8. "Man is soul only, and cannot be anything else. This soul, however, unfolds itself externally in the life of the body, and internally in the life of the mind. Twofold in its development, it is one in origin, and the center of this union is one, personality.

9. "The particles of the body are not all a part of man; they are dust, and only their connection and the life connecting them is truly human.

10. "It is not nature nor matter that produces personality, but God, who is the ground of all personality. We can know a thing thoroughly only when we are acquainted with its ground. So man must know God before he can become truly acquainted with himself."

These philosophemes are quoted from notes of a student taken during the delivery of lectures by Dr. Rauch, and they represent him as he thought and taught, probably, in the last year of active life, 1840-1841. See "Recollections of Col-

lege Life, at Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa.," by the Rev. Theodore Apple, D.D., pp. 276, 277.

Dr. Rauch aimed at reproducing the idealism and truth of German philosophy in an English form in the light of Christian revelation. He introduced an Anglo-German life into the College, which, though modified and perfected by his successors, the College has retained to the present time. Though chiefly a philosopher, the first president of Marshall College was a decided and humble Christian. His philosophy was neither rationalism nor pantheism, neither sensationalism nor transcendentalism in any false sense, but really Christian. The impulse and peculiar character which the institution received from him in the beginning was not, as some persons have alleged, hostile nor prejudicial to sound Christian ideas, but subservient and favorable to the progress of orthodox scientific theology and true practical religion.

Let us pass now to some special consideration of the attitude of Dr. Rauch toward Christianity.

Educated and trained in the universities of Germany when the philosophy of Hegel was in the ascendent, and largely shaped as to his general view of world-history by Charles Daub, his teacher and personal friend, who represented the right wing of Hegelianism, it was but natural that Dr. Rauch, when he came to America, would be deeply imbued with the spirit of this profound philosophy. There is reason, however, to believe that, even before leaving Germany, a reaction had set in toward more conservative ideas concerning the facts of Christianity than were then prevalent in the universities. On this question Dr. Nevin expresses his judgment as follows: "Dr. Rauch took pleasure in speaking of what he owed to his venerable instructor (Dr. Daub) in the way of knowledge. But this was not the whole of his obligation. It included also an important spiritual benefit. He felt that he had been morally invigorated by coming within the range of his influence. It proved a powerful help to his faith. How far his religious views as they

had existed previously to this time may have needed reformation, I am not prepared to say. Probably there was no direct revolution accomplished in the case. Whatever latitudinarianism our youthful theologian may have been chargeable with before may have been merely the general disease of the country, which attached itself almost necessarily at the time to a university education, poisoning the mind of the student, sometimes more and sometimes less. Nor was it fully eradicated in Dr. Rauch's case, it would seem, even during his stay at Heidelberg. But a new turn was given to his mind. His confidence in the great fundamental truths of Christianity was confirmed. And, more still, productive ideas, the seeds of living thought, were introduced into the soil of his spirit, which, favored by other influences subsequently, germinated and brought forth fruit, after their kind, in thoughts both sound and thorough with regard to religion generally."

As Dr. Rauch set his foot on American soil he came under the power of associations which were favorable to the culture and development of the "productive ideas, the seeds of living thought," to which Dr. Nevin refers, and his views of theism and of Christianity steadily became more mature and more positive. One particular fact may be named. When he became president of Marshall College he came frequently into contact with one man who exerted upon him a powerful spiritual influence. That man was the Rev. Henry L. Rice, pastor of the Reformed Church of Chambersburg, a man in middle life, of well-trained mind, of sound judgment, of deep spiritual experience, and from the heart consecrated to the work of the Christian ministry. Rauch and Rice were congenial. Each complemented the other. Rauch was the more learned, and the more familiar with the history of metaphysical thought; Rice was the more spiritual, and entered the more freely into full sympathy with the mysteries of the Christian faith as set forth in the books of the New Testament. The profound religious spirit and devoted Christian life of Mr. Rice were honored and sincerely appreciated by

Dr. Rauch; spontaneously Rauch yielded to the uplifting power of the Christian principles and the Christian life of his friend. The intimate association of the scholar and philosopher with this godly pastor in Chambersburg formed an epoch in the religious history of the philosopher. Several times Dr. Rauch entered into conversation with the writer on his associations with the Rev. Mr. Rice, speaking of the excellence of his Christian character in most commendatory terms. On one occasion, expressing himself with somewhat more freedom than usual, and evidently deeply moved, he said that Mr. Rice was not the means of his conversion, but the means of the "revival" (that was the word he used) of faith and Christian life in his own heart. Rauch prized his association with Rice for different reasons, but chiefly for his spirituality of mind and his genuine religious experience.

Dr. Rauch was ordained to the holy ministry by the Synod of Frederick in the fall of 1832. In connection with the proceedings preliminary to the ordination an interesting incident occurred which is deserving of record. Some one on the floor of synod moved that the application of Dr. Rauch, who came from the Reformed Church on the continent of Europe, be referred with his credentials, as was the rule in similar cases, to a special committee with instructions to hold a *tentâmen* with him to ascertain his doctrinal views on the fundamentals of Christianity. At once a prominent elder arose to protest against the proposed action. As the applicant was a graduate of the University of Marburg, and had been appointed to an ordinary professorship in the University of Giessen, and as his credentials were full and regular, it was, as he thought, a species of indignity to subject the gentleman to a critical examination. Then Dr. Rauch asked and received the privilege of the floor; he expressed the desire that such a committee should be appointed. He did not wish that any exception be made in his favor. On the contrary, it was his desire to be admitted to the ministry according to the usual method, just as all others in like circumstances were received. And the committee was appointed.

The inaugural address of Rev. Dr. F. A. Rauch as Principal of the Classical School and Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary was delivered at York, Pa., October 18, 1832.

As affording an insight into his theological status and Christian spirit in the second year of his American life the address is an important document. After stating what he considers the principal object of all education, adverting briefly to the relation which the Classical Institution and the Theological Seminary have to one another, and vindicating theological study from the reproach of being only the cause of divisions and pernicious innovations, the author proceeds to discuss two main questions, the object of theology, and the manner in which the divine must seek to accomplish it.

In answer to the question: What is the aim of theological study? Dr. Rauch lays down four propositions:

Theology must be the handmaid of religion, and must aid in the accomplishment of its object, the deliverance of mankind from misery.

It is the aim of theology to destroy infidelity, and thus to remove the enemy of religion.

The aim of theology is to expel superstition, and substitute true faith in its stead.

Finally, it is the purpose of theology to preserve the Christian faith in its purity and truth where it has once been established.

These propositions are consistently developed, and presented in direct, unambiguous and positive terms, revealing the simplicity of the professor's faith, the sincerity and the depth of his conviction of the truth of Christianity.

In discussing the second main inquiry: How shall the theologian attain this object of theology? Doctor Rauch says: We might answer with the utmost brevity—through Christ alone. He is the only way to salvation, as He is the only way to faith; when Christ does not teach, we learn in vain; when He does not build, we build in vain.

Christ, therefore, is the only way to religion; and as religion is the subject of theology, Christ is the only way to theology. From this main proposition we deduce, he says, the following rules for the conduct of the divine:

1. He must approach his studies out of love to Christ. He must possess humility and piety; piety must be the motive that impels him to the study of theology. Where living faith is wanting, theological study will never succeed; and the saying is verified: He only who is of the Spirit understands spiritual things.

2. The divine must approach his studies free from pride, as though faith were the result of his own reasoning. He only who studies with a believing heart will understand religion, not he who hopes by reasoning only to become a participant of faith. Faith must guide reason, and reason will then establish faith, and defend it against every doubt.

3. The divine must approach his studies free from the conceit that he can comprehend the whole system of faith, and as if there were no mysteries whatever in religion. In every idea there is a limit, and every idea itself is a limited thought. Every limit again is finite, and hence, however beautiful and sublime ideas may be, they are incapable of conveying an adequate conception of God, who is infinity itself. The human breast is too weak a vessel for infinitude in its full glory.

4. The divine must approach his studies free from any dangerous influence of earthly science. However great his knowledge may be, in comparison with Christ he knows nothing. The will and the understanding must be silent, ready only to receive what is imparted. Both must restrain him from profanely subjecting the holy Scriptures to the ordinary investigations of the natural mind. He must not, from the pleasure he takes in the science of language, proceed in his criticism of the Bible, as if he had a Greek or Roman classic before him.—And now permit me to repeat in a figure what I have said. As when the earth turns to the sun light is diffused, and cheerful warmth streams forth on all animals and

plants, so falsehood, darkness and spiritual death cease in man, when he turns from his own desires and imaginations upwards to the sun of righteousness, Jesus Christ. There is our life; there is the source of our spiritual existence. Upward to Him must the whole course of our inquiries tend.

Thus far proceeds an outline of the inaugural discourse. A republication of the inaugural would have been a fitting and valuable contribution to the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Franklin and Marshall College. It may be found in the first number of the *Messenger of the German Reformed Church*, New Series, issued in quarto form, January, 1833. It is presumable that but few persons were aware of the fact that this inaugural* was in existence and was accessible in printed form, as no reference, so far as the writer's knowledge extends, was in any instance made to it.

The whole term of service of the Rev. Dr. F. A. Rauch in the interest of theological and classical education was about eight years and six months, from October, 1832, to March, 1841, when it pleased God to call him to the better fellowship with Himself. For three years, from 1832 to 1835, he filled the office of Principal of the Classical School, located at York, Pa., with superior ability and much success. From the organization of Marshall College in 1836 to the end of his life in 1841, a period of nearly six years, he was the president of the new institution and Professor of Psychology and Ethics. During this entire period of nearly nine years he occupied the Chair of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary, and accordingly, as may be seen, he performed the work of two men; and the work he did he did thoroughly, delivering carefully prepared lectures on all the branches taught by him.

Dr. Rauch has been called the founder of Marshall College. And he merits and bears this title with the utmost propriety. Not with silver and gold, however, did he lay the foundation; but with material far more costly and far more durable.

* In the original German published with the Minutes of Synod for 1833.

Christian faith, sound scholarship, organic thought and nobleness of spiritual life were united in the foundation which he laid.

It was the custom of Dr. Rauch when he preached to close the sermon with a brief but carefully written prayer. After the same manner he concluded his inaugural discourse in October, 1832. That prayer will be an appropriate conclusion to this memorial of his life and work in the service of the Reformed Church:

"To this end, O God, grant Thy blessing; we are weak and nothing, but Thou are almighty; we do what Thou dost in us; without Thee we can do nothing. Show Thy servants therefore the way in which they should go; and when dejection steals upon them, then fill them with courage; and where darkness surrounds them, there let Thy light shine. Bless our institutions, and let Thy spirit hover over them; keep all the teachers of Thy word united, and give to Christians of every denomination a love for our enterprises, that our strength may not be insulated and fail, but manifest itself strong and mighty. Awaken and preserve in us the love of our brethren beyond the ocean; and if our labors are crowned with success, may it be our thanksgiving to say: Christ's is the honor! Christ's is the glory. Amen."

II.

THE FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.

PRESIDENT JOHN S. STAHR, D.D.

It may be safely said that neither the founders of Franklin nor of Marshall College had an adequate knowledge of the amount of money required to carry forward a successful literary institution. These men, large-hearted and enterprising, were willing to make sacrifices in the interest of higher education, and, realizing how vitally the welfare of the community and the prosperity of the Christian church were dependent upon the founding and maintenance of a college, they expected others to make sacrifices also, so that all might join to provide with a generous hand, out of the limited wealth which men had acquired in those days, or even out of their scanty earnings and savings, the means wherewith to carry forward and to endow the institutions which they were instrumental in starting upon their educational career. They, happily, did not foresee how much was needed, nor how little, relatively, was forthcoming; nor did they have even the faintest foreboding of the long and arduous struggle through which both colleges had to pass, and of the privations and limitations under which the professors in these institutions had to toil on, often unappreciated, always underpaid, and frequently obliged to do double duty that the life of the colleges, dear to them as the apple of the eye, might be saved from utter extinction. If all the difficulties which arose could have been foreseen, it is doubtful whether any of those who stood forth as champions and directors of the educational movement of those days would have had the faith and courage to undertake the arduous task to which they put their hands. But, through the guidance of a gracious Providence, and by the heroic labors of earnest,

faithful, devoted men, the cause of higher education in the Reformed Church, like Israel of old, was delivered out of bondage to strangers, pursued its journey through a wilderness of trial, disaster, disappointment and suffering, until it reached the Promised Land—not by any means the land of plenty, but yet a land of stable abode, of prosperous activity, and of hopeful outlook for the future.

When Franklin College was organized in 1787, the projectors and friends of the institution, beginning with Benjamin Franklin after whom the college was named, made generous subscriptions to the funds which were deemed necessary in order that a hopeful beginning might be made. It was expected that the new college would meet with great favor among the Germans, and that the contributions speedily to be made to the funds together with the receipts for tuition would be sufficient to insure the college a prosperous career. This expectation was soon disappointed. The response on the part of the people was not so hearty and the income from tuition not so large as had been anticipated, and almost from the very beginning there was an inability to meet the current expenses of the institution and pay the professors' salaries. As is well known, the enterprise, instead of developing into a full-fledged college, remained on the plane of a high school, sometimes intermitted, then again reorganized, now in financial distress, and then again, by a careful husbanding of all resources, accumulating money until in the course of time the nucleus of a fair endowment was secured. Moneys contributed were carefully invested. So were the proceeds from the sale of the 10,000 acres of land in Bradford and Venango counties which the legislature had given to the college at a time when they had scarcely any value. The trustees looked carefully after these lands, and by prudent management, especially through Samuel Dale, Esq., in due time disposed of them to actual settlers. In this way it came to pass that Franklin College, reorganized and united with the Lancaster County Academy (which had received a gift of \$3,000 from the state and had

purchased a site and erected a building on Lime street) found itself in possession of a pecuniary outfit of respectable proportions. It was supposed, when the first overtures for the union of Franklin and Marshall Colleges was made, that the property was worth about \$45,000, and the Reformed Church was expected to pay to the Lutherans \$15,000 for their one third interest. But when the actual transfer was made and the value of the property was carefully appraised, it was found to be \$51,508.84. The Reformed Church accordingly paid \$17,169.61, and secured in this way for Franklin and Marshall College in investments and real estate the whole amount designated.

Marshall College, which grew out of the High School established at York, entered upon its career with brighter prospects. In the first place, as the future location of the Theological Seminary and of the proposed new college was made to depend upon the offers of money subscribed for the use of these institutions by competing localities, strenuous efforts were put forth by those who desired to have the institutions in their midst. Under the inspiring leadership of the Rev. Jacob Mayer the comparatively small and obscure village of Mercersburg pledged itself to raise \$10,000 for this purpose, and this pledge was accepted by the Synod. Efforts were also put forth at once to secure contributions from the church at large, and the Rev. H. L. Rice was appointed agent for this purpose. Mr. Rice was remarkably successful, and in 1838 it was reported that \$5,807 had been secured by him. His untimely death was greatly regretted; but the work was taken up immediately by the Rev. B. C. Wolff, who reported \$3,890, secured in 1838, and \$3,126.75 (after deducting salary and expenses) in 1839. The state also appropriated \$12,000 for the use of the college. In this way the outlook seemed quite hopeful, particularly when the present condition was compared with the state of things at York, where a deficit of more than \$2,000 was reported in the operation of the Classical School.

The funds secured for the college, partly in cash and partly

in notes, were either direct gifts or contributions on the scholarship plan. This plan entered very largely into the financial history both of Marshall College, and of Franklin and Marshall, and its development finally led to consequences which were not foreseen at the outset. The Board of Trustees made provision to the effect that whenever an individual contributed \$500 to the endowment of the college there should be issued to him a certificate of scholarship which entitled the holder to designate in perpetuity one student who should receive free tuition in the college. Such certificates were issued in return for cash or interest-bearing securities, and were legally transferable. It was an expedient which, no doubt, increased the endowment; but, at the same time, it diminished the income from tuition upon which the college also depended for maintenance and support.

No sooner, however, were the college and seminary fairly established at Mercersburg than it began to appear that the situation was not by any means free from difficulties and embarrassment. In the first place the buildings offered for the temporary use of the college were inadequate. The Seminary, in course of time, received a good building which was afterwards also used by the college upon the payment of room rent. Although a site for the college building had been secured and society halls were erected the college got no farther than the possession of the ground and a large quantity of bricks. In the second place it was soon found that the income from invested funds, tuition, etc., was not equal to the annual expenses, and it was not long before the financial embarrassment become serious.

Besides the original subscriptions and the proceeds from the sale of scholarships made from time to time, there was a special effort made to increase the funds of the college during the celebration of the so-called centennial of the Reformed Church in the United States. In 1840 the synod resolved "that the year 1841 be observed as a centenary celebration of the church in this country," and that united efforts be put

forth "to raise at least \$100,000 for the Institutions of the church." The specific objects were to be: (1) The Seminary; (2) the College; (3) Beneficiary Education, the choice being left to the contributors. The printing establishment and missions also received a portion of the contributions in some of the classes. The securing of subscriptions was continued for several years, and the gross result was pledges to the amount of \$81,960.47, of which \$44,272.48 were designated in favor of Marshall College. Unfortunately these pledges were paid very slowly and some of them not at all. In 1853 there had been paid \$27,589.88 and there were still unpaid \$16,682.60. If the whole amount pledged had been promptly paid, the history of Marshall College might have been different. But the moneys came in small amounts, there was no interest available from the investment, and in the end nearly two fifths of the amount pledged was lost.

The same sad fate overtook many of the original pledges and scholarship notes. The \$10,000 pledged by Mercersburg were never fully paid, and the sureties for the same were exonerated by the synod. Interest on notes given was deferred, and in many instances could not be collected. The Rev. Jacob Mayer was commissioned as agent to collect outstanding pledges and unpaid interest, and to secure new subscriptions. But notwithstanding every effort and the mutual assistance rendered to each other by college and seminary, Dr. Nevin acting as president of the college and Dr. Schaff's salary, for services rendered as professor of German in the college, being paid in part by proceeds from college scholarships, the situation became worse from year to year, and it became painfully evident that unless large additions to the college funds were secured, the institution could not be kept alive. In 1850 Dr. Nevin resigned his professorship in the Seminary on the ground that for a long time his salary had not been paid and he saw no other way to bring the matter to proper consideration, and, at the same time, that the necessities of the college seemed to require his whole time for that institution, as an

alternative more tolerable than its being allowed to fail altogether by his withdrawal from its service. The synod yielded to his proposal to serve the department of mathematics in the college, but only as a temporary arrangement in the hope that by a vigorous effort on the part of the church the institutions would be extricated from their perilous condition. There was no relief found, however, except in the proposition now brought forward to unite Marshall College with Franklin College at Lancaster, and, however, reluctant the friends of Marshall College were to take this step, they felt that it was the only expedient that could save the life of the college.

The actual condition of Marshall College at this time can best be seen from the following exhibit of its assets when the first overtures for union with Franklin College were made:

Scholarship notes, bearing interest.....	\$9,508.97
Invested funds, including Seminary debt.....	9,289.98
Notes due the College.....	979.82
Cash in the hands of the Treasurer.....	300.00
Scholarship subscriptions, no bond, but interest paid..	1,500.00
Suits instituted, and subscriptions.....	2,089.98
Tuition due by students.....	509.30
Philosophical Apparatus	1,000.00
Due upon scholarships.....	9,520.66
Uncollected subscriptions	7,000.00
	<u>41,698.71</u>

REAL ESTATE.

Society Halls.....	\$11,000
Preparatory, etc.	6,000
Professors' House, etc.	5,000
Cost of Ground.....	3,000
Libraries and Cabinets.....	<u>3,000</u>
	28,000.00
	<u>\$69,698.71</u>

When the actual transfer of assets was made to the Treasurer of Franklin and Marshall College in 1853, the face value was \$15,339.89 and the real estate belonging to the college at Mercersburg was supposed to be worth not more than \$6,000. In fact after careful examination the Finance Committee came to the conclusion that the assets would not realize more than \$10,000 in all.

The union of the two colleges was effected in 1853. It required strenuous efforts to raise the \$17,000 necessary to pay for the Lutheran interest in Franklin College; but when the money was needed it was forthcoming. Not that it had all been collected. Part of it was borrowed, and with the amount secured in this way the church had to struggle for ten years. It was a part of the plan of union that the city and county of Lancaster must contribute \$25,000 for the site and buildings needed for the new institution. This was an undertaking of some magnitude in those days, but it was accomplished in a comparatively short time by the indefatigable energy of the Rev. J. C. Bucher, D.D., who was appointed agent for the purpose, and who was ably assisted by local members of the Board of Trustees, and when the time for consummating the union came, it was reported that the whole amount was deposited in the Lancaster banks. The conditions were, therefore, met, and the proceeds of the assets from both Marshall and Franklin Colleges, were paid into the treasury of the new institution. The balance sheet at the end of the year 1854 showed: Loans and mortgage, \$40,430.58; tuition account, \$1,436.20; contingent fund, \$436.70; interest, \$2,747.64; expenses, \$5,405.47.

It was apparent at once that a much larger endowment was needed to carry forward the work of the college, and the Board of Trustees resolved to take immediate measures to raise the endowment to \$100,000 by the sale of temporary, family and perpetual scholarships, costing respectively \$50, \$250 and \$500. Not much was done, however, along this line until after the erection of the College Building, and the election of Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., to the presidency. The College Building cost \$25,136.62. The Board of Trustees selected sites for the Halls of the Literary Societies and appropriated money and scholarships to the societies to aid them in the erection of their halls and to indemnify them to some extent for the loss which they had suffered by the removal of Marshall College from Mercersburg.

It required both faith and courage to undertake the work which devolved upon the first president of Franklin and Marshall College, and it is but scant justice to the Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart to say that he discharged his duties with great fidelity, ability and skill. In fact he has never received the credit which really belongs to him for the painstaking care, unwearied industry and signal ability which he displayed as a disciplinarian, a teacher, and a financial manager. The Board of Trustees, as has been stated, authorized the sale of scholarships. But as the financial needs were urgent, it was resolved to sell temporary scholarships (good for four years) at \$50 each to the extent of 800 so as to raise \$40,000. To effect this, and to aid the literary societies whose building operations had brought them into deep water and whose halls were in danger of being sold by the sheriff, Dr. Gerhart entered the field in person and canvassed from house to house to secure the funds necessary for relief. In 1856 Mr. John Heilman was appointed agent for the college to assist in the sale of scholarships and the collection of funds, a work in which he was eminently successful. A number of ministers and prominent elders also took part in the work. There were 512 of these scholarships sold, but 59 of them, it seems, were not paid for and were, therefore, not issued.

The sale of permanent scholarships was continued till a much later period. Whenever a contribution of \$500 or more was made, the contributor was entitled to one scholarship for every five hundred dollars. Some of these scholarships were also issued, as has been said, to the literary societies and some in lieu of services rendered or contributions made in the form of salaries remitted to the Board of Trustees. In all there were at least 117, including the scholarships of Marshall College which were made valid in Franklin and Marshall.

It will be seen that a great deal of money was secured for the college on the scholarship plan, and as long as the original donors were living the scholarships worked no serious harm, as they were granted only to members of the family, bene-

ficiary students or persons in whom the holders were personally interested. But in course of time, as they were legally transferable, they passed out of the hands of the original owners, or after their decease, the scholarships were bought by strangers for a mere pittance, and then hired out to students for about \$15 per year. In this way the amount received for tuition was so greatly diminished that at last it ceased to be an appreciable quantity. As propositions had frequently been discussed looking to the granting of free tuition to certain districts upon the payment of a definite sum, it was concluded at last, in 1890, in view of the fact that the college now furnished library, reading-room, gymnasium and laboratory facilities which were not included in the old charges of \$39 per year for tuition, to abolish separate tuition fees altogether, and to make one general fee for contingencies and for all the various special items enumerated.

The financial crisis of 1857 and the disturbed state of the country at the beginning of the Civil War made the prosecution of the work of endowment difficult. In 1861, however, the balance sheet of the treasurer footed up \$71,019.29. In 1863 the church celebrated the Tercentenary of the Heidelberg Catechism, and in connection with this celebration special efforts were made to increase the endowment. Elder Henry Leonard, very appropriately called the Fisherman on account of the signal service rendered the church as a collector, was appointed special agent for the College. The contributions of this tercentenary year to the College amounted to \$36,084.18.

After the close of the war, it was felt that renewed efforts ought to be made to increase the endowment, and to challenge the church for this purpose it was proposed to recall Dr. J. W. Nevin to the presidency. When the call was extended to him, he replied that as this call came to him as part of a general movement to enlarge the operations of the Institution on a scale answerable to the wants of the present time—a movement which contemplated the addition of at least \$200,-

000 to the endowment of the college—he was willing to accept *provisionally* and *conditionally*, making his final acceptance dependent on the willingness of others also to do what was needed. This was in 1866. In the same year Mr. Jacob Bausman was elected treasurer, and the securities turned over to him amounted to \$98,447.53. The Rev. Dr. B. C. Wolff acted as agent for the college at this time and secured a number of subscriptions and contributions. He was assisted, and afterward succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Theodore Appel. The latter proposed the so-called Dollar Endowment Plan—a contribution of one dollar from every baptized member of the church, which yielded \$5,510.96. Mr. D. S. Dieffenbacher, while a student in the Theological Seminary, was also commissioned to act as agent, and he secured a number of handsome contributions, especially in Lancaster city. The Audenried Professorship was endowed by Mr. Lewis Audenried, of Philadelphia, by a bequest of \$35,000, which, after deducting collateral inheritance tax, was paid into the treasury in December, 1874, realizing for the college \$33,250. During the years 1873–75, the Rev. C. U. Heilman served as agent for the college, securing in all subscriptions and contributions amounting to \$30,945.92. Many of these subscriptions, however, were in the form of notes, and, as always happens in such cases, a large number were not collectable. To illustrate, subscriptions towards the endowment of an Alumni Professorship were obtained to the extent of about \$11,500, but only \$6,146.58 were actually paid into the treasury.

Ever since the founding of Franklin and Marshall College it had been felt that there ought to be a dormitory on the campus for the use of the students, and some funds were secured for the purpose during the first few years of its existence. The project was not lost sight of, and additions were made from time to time to the building fund. At last, in 1872, the Board resolved to proceed with the erection of such a building, using the funds on hand, and selling some of the securities held, with a view of replacing them later again when the necessary

amounts were collected. The building was named Harbaugh Hall, and its first cost was \$11,451.29. A little later the Academy Building was erected at a first cost of \$19,643.83, paid for partly by moneys collected by Mr. Heilman, and partly out of college funds. It was expected that the buildings would prove a good investment and yield an income more than equal to the interest on the money. In this the Trustees were mistaken, although in other respects the buildings rendered an important service to the college.

In 1873-74 the professors, their families, and the students constituting St. Stephen's Church, undertook the enlarging of the College Chapel, contributing and collecting from friends of the College the funds necessary for this purpose without drawing on the resources of the Board of Trustees. The expenses were as follows:

First contract for building the extension.....	\$3700.00
Second contract, pews, chancel, etc.....	856.16
Matting, carpets, lamps, etc.....	138.08
Fresco	350.00
Total	\$5044.24

This does not include the cost of the chandeliers and the electric wiring, nor the Memorial Window and the Lectern placed in the Chapel by the Nevin family in memory of Dr. and Mrs. J. Williamson Nevin, nor the other memorial windows now in the Chapel.

At a later date, through the efforts of Miss Alice Nevin and Mrs. J. B. Kieffer, assisted by a number of students, the funds were secured for the pipe organ now in the Chapel, built by Hook and Hastings in 1897 at the listed price of \$2,000.

It was known to friends of the College that the Wilhelm family, through their pastor, the Rev. A. B. Koplin, D.D., had become acquainted with the needs of the College and Seminary at Lancaster, and were thinking of bequeathing their large estate to these institutions. When the pastoral charge to which they belonged became vacant, it was consid-

ered important that they should be kept in touch with these institutions so that their purpose might ripen and reach its consummation. As the Rev. C. U. Heilman received a call to the charge, he felt it his duty, therefore, to relinquish his agency and accept the call. Benjamin Wilhelm, before his death, by a deed of trust, had made over his interest in the estate to his brother Peter, and their sister Polly was willing to do the same with the understanding that Peter Wilhelm should by will transfer the larger portion of the estate to the College and Seminary, two thirds of certain farms to the College and one third to the Seminary. In course of time Peter Wilhelm made a will to this effect; but unfortunately he died before thirty days had elapsed after the making of the will, and some of the heirs filed objections to its being admitted to probate. This led to serious complications, and, although the claim of the College was considered good on account of the previously expressed intentions and Benjamin Wilhelm's deed of trust, to avoid long and expensive litigation it was thought best to effect a compromise with the contesting heirs. The College took all the risk and responsibility in the matter with the understanding that it should be reimbursed out of the estate, and that, after this had been done the proceeds should be divided between the College and the Seminary in the proportion originally intended. The whole compromise with expenses included cost the College \$26,285.16. The interest on this sum from 1879 to 1889, when the proceeds from the sale of bonds finally exceeded the outlay, was \$14,508.76, making the total outlay \$40,793.76. This amount has all been recovered by the College and in addition the College has received \$18,469.45, and the Theological Seminary \$9,234.72. Most of the land has been sold, though the mineral rights have been reserved. The College, however, still owns a small portion of the Matlock farm, and the whole of the Addison farm.

When Dr. Nevin retired from the presidency in 1876, it was found that the funds of the College would not warrant

the election of a successor at a full salary. During the year 1876-77 there was no president. Professor W. M. Nevin presided at faculty meetings, and the work was carried forward with the assistance of the Seminary professors. In 1877 the Board of Trustees unanimously invited Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., to fill the position of president in connection with his labors in the Theological Seminary, and voted him the nominal salary of \$400. It was felt now to be of the greatest importance that the endowment should be enlarged, and that better facilities should be secured for College work, especially a Library Building and a Science Hall. The first step in the direction of enlargement was the erection of the Daniel Scholl Observatory by Mrs. James M. Hood, of Frederick, Md. Mrs. Hood, in the first place, gave \$10,000 for this purpose. Additional contributions were made by friends of the College so as to secure a more complete outfit than was at first intended, the whole costing \$13,579. Later Mrs. Hood contributed \$5,000 additional for further equipment and endowment. In 1886 Mr. Chas. Santee, whose generous gifts so frequently blessed the College, contributed \$10,000, in car trust certificates, to the general endowment fund. This gift was especially acceptable at this time, as it helped to tide over the stringency caused by the withdrawal of funds for the Wilhelm compromise.

The celebration of the Centennial of Franklin College in 1887 was an event of great significance in the history of Franklin and Marshall College. In 1883 Dr. Apple had called the attention of the Board of Trustees to the importance of turning it to proper account, and in 1886 Professor Stahr, at the request of the Committee on Instruction, presented a report in which he especially urged the enlargement of the scientific department. The contributions of the centennial year were intended: (1) for the endowment of the presidency, (2) for the establishing of scientific laboratories, and (3) for the erection of a library building. A good deal of enthusiasm and interest was manifested at this time and gen-

erous contributions were made both by individuals and by congregations. It was found, however, that it would be absolutely necessary, if results commensurate with the occasion were to be reached, that some one should push the raising of funds by a personal canvass. As no other way seemed to offer, Professor Stahr volunteered to undertake the work; he was relieved from College duties and appointed financial agent. He devoted the whole of 1887-1888 to this work, and part of his time during the year 1888-'89. He was assisted afterwards by the Rev. J. F. DeLong, D.D., until the work had to be suspended on account of the effort made on behalf of the Theological Seminary. During this canvass no notes were accepted, and while there were subscriptions and verbal pledges which went by default to the extent of several thousand dollars, the net results were in cash, and that was very satisfactory. The presidency endowment fund received \$36,872.33; the scientific department \$2,700. There were other special contributions and old notes collected swelling the amount to over \$40,000. The ladies raised \$1,277.77 by the "Geometrical Progression" plan, and Drs. Kieffer and Schiedt secured special contributions, the former for the Library and Reading Room, the latter for the equipment of the Biological Department, amounting to about \$4,000.

The special contributions made during the centennial year by the Third Street Reformed Church of Easton and Mrs. J. M. Hood, of Frederick, Md., made it possible in 1890 to provide a chemical laboratory for the College, which, although small, answered an excellent purpose, and, together with the biological outfit, marked a new era in the history of the College. The outlay was about \$3,000. A little later the Gymnasium was erected and equipped at an expense of a little over \$7,000. The larger portion of the cost was secured by private subscriptions under the leadership of the Hon. W. U. Hensel. There was, however, a balance due of about \$3,000 which was paid out of College funds. The new Library Building, named the J. Watts de Peyster Library in

honor of the donor, Gen. J. Watts de Peyster, of Tivoli, N. Y., was erected in 1896-97. It cost with equipment about \$30,000. It is a credit to the College and a worthy monument of the generous donor.

In view of the rapid enlargement of the work of the College the necessity of providing a larger endowment and a better equipment came to be more and more keenly felt. The Board of Trustees, accordingly, after careful deliberation, in 1895 adopted a plan which it was hoped would lead to a material increase in the endowment, and make a better equipment possible. The plan was that of a "Savings and Loan Association" intended to be auxiliary to a general movement along the lines suggested. A beginning was immediately made, and with a great deal of enthusiasm \$25,250 were pledged in the meeting of the Board. It was understood that three-fourths of the amount raised in this way should go into the endowment fund, while the remaining one fourth should be available for buildings and improvements. To carry forward the scheme it was necessary to put a financial secretary in the field, and the Rev. Ambrose M. Schmidt was elected to the position. Mr. Schmidt labored with great fidelity and zeal, and accomplished a good work for the College. But the "Savings and Loan" scheme did not prove successful. The amount secured in stock and interest was \$31,774.75. While engaged in this work Mr. Schmidt urged the importance of a new Science Building to several friends of the College, who, in turn, suggested the propriety of taking special pledges for this purpose. This was the beginning of the movement which resulted in the erection of the Science Building which now adorns the campus and of which all the friends of the College are justly proud. When Mr. Schmidt had secured pledges to the amount of \$11,000, the Hon. Geo. F. Baer, president of the Board of Trustees, pledged himself to see to it that the remaining \$9,000 which the Board wanted before beginning to build would be forthcoming in due time. Mr. Schmidt continued his labors until June, 1901, by which time

the whole amount pledged was \$31,307.91. At the annual commencement of 1901 additional pledges were made by members of the Board of Trustees and others, and it was resolved to proceed with the work until the building was finished. The building with heating apparatus, furniture, grading of grounds, etc., cost in round numbers \$65,000. The Chemical Laboratories were equipped by Mr. Milton S. Hershey, of Lancaster, at a cost of nearly \$5,000; the Biological Laboratories by the family of the late B. Wolff, Jr., of Pittsburgh, at a cost of \$5,000; the Geological Equipment was given by Mr. Chas. F. Rengier, costing \$1,000. The whole outlay is, therefore, about \$76,000. A considerable portion of this amount is, as yet, unpaid. But if the individual and synodical pledges already given will be promptly paid, the whole amount will be covered without difficulty.

During the last few years a number of legacies have been received by the College, the last and largest being one of \$10,000 from the estate of the late Jacob Y. Dietz. The endowment of the College at present is \$206,896.96.

The first thought suggested by this rapid survey of the financial history of the College is that it is unwise and unsafe to rely upon pledges and notes which have a long time to run. It is sad beyond expression to read in the minutes of synod and the minutes of the Board of Trustees constant complaints and the evidence of great distress on account of the failure to pay interest and the default of principal by those who had given pledges of this kind.

The second thought is that there is reason for profound gratitude in the growth of the endowment and the value of college property. This growth, if slow, was steady; and there is abundant evidence to show that the finances of the College were conscientiously and skillfully managed. The funds were carefully invested and very rarely indeed has there been any trouble in getting payment of interest or principal when needed.

The present condition of the College from the financial

point of view is a guarantee of stability, and encourages hope for the future. But it is, after all, only the foundation of an adequate endowment, upon which it is necessary to build a much larger superstructure. The College needs a new chapel, a good dormitory (an inferior one would be money thrown away), and even a new College Building, if any one is willing to give it. But it needs, above all, an endowment of at least \$500,000 in the near future to keep pace with the best equipped colleges of the same class. If the friends of the College will properly exert themselves there will soon be classes averaging at least fifty members; and the Faculty, which ought now to be one third larger, will of necessity have to be increased. There is need of a division of labor; business, management, and teaching ought to be to a greater extent separated. The College as it is deserves the hearty support of its alumni and friends, and such support will surely bring a constant stream of bequests, and, it is to be hoped, large gifts towards its endowment.

III.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE AND THE CLASSICS.

BY PROF. JOHN B. KIEFFER, PH.D.

From no point of view does the discovery of America seem a more marvelous event in human history than from that of its absolute timeliness and its adequacy. Had it occurred centuries earlier, it would not have carried with it the ripe results of the movement towards intellectual and spiritual freedom which began with Petrarch; had it been delayed for centuries that same impulse probably would have been crushed by the power of absolutism in church and state. Moreover, to all the hopes for social peace and individual enfranchisement which the nations of the war-weary old world had entertained—vaguely, indeed, but still with earnest longing—it, and it alone, furnished the sufficient realization. Only in a new world, far removed from the old, could a new social order establish itself which should cast off the conventions that bound men's words and deeds no less than their consciences—an order in many respects unique in the history of mankind, and in none more so than in that of its flexibility and the fearlessness and frankness of its freedom. It was owing to these conditions that social and political life in America assumed forms which challenge, not only the wonder, but even the savage criticism of those whose civilization and culture are of the old order and type. But even the pessimistic Mr. Arnold in the bitterest of his caustic grumblings at all things American was forced to admit that here he had found a people that "sees things straight and sees them clear," and "institutions which do in fact suit the people well, and from which they derive much actual benefit," likening these institu-

tions later on to a suit of clothes which fits the wearer to perfection.

Now it would be strange, indeed, if institutions for the higher education of our people were not included amongst those here referred to, seeing that the speaker was more closely identified with matters of education than with any other in his daily life, and inasmuch as education, next to religion, in this country received most unstinted care from the very beginning. Growing with all the other phases of our national life, our schools, from the lowest to the highest, have adapted themselves to our needs, until they as well as our political institutions do fit us to perfection, and are, if carefully cherished, qualified to give to the state such results as are needed in its future citizens of all classes. It could not have been otherwise, as the briefest review of the history of education would show. The stagnation and retrogression of the ten centuries preceding the age of Petrarch was broken by a renewed intellectual activity most fittingly styled the *Renaissance*. It marked the creation of a new atmosphere, and the diffusion of a new spirit. It was in reality the coming to life of forces hostile to superstition and bigotry, to pedantry and to tyranny in school as well as in state. It was a longing for freedom working for itself a visible body, and a passionate striving for that which is even better than freedom—the knowledge of how to use it for lofty and noble ends in the conduct of life. It marked the protest of the human soul against the narrowing and deadening specialization of mediæval ecclesiastical schools whose sole aim was to prepare men for the church, for law, or for medicine. And if Roman Christianity, of whose power and influence all this was the visible sign, did eventually revert to earlier conditions, this impulse to freedom was not lost in the change, but found in Protestant churches a congenial and fruitful home. The social upheavals and religious persecutions which sent successive waves of colonists to the new world sent with them also unavoidably that for which they were seeking new homes

—freedom of thought as well as freedom of conscience. It may, indeed, be true, as is sometimes said, that the colonists of New England, because of their Puritanical religious views, and those of Virginia, with their prevailingly commercial purposes, did not early manifest any great desire for what is mostly spoken of as the *humanities*, but is better styled *humanism*, in education. But even so we find the work so happily inaugurated by Vittorino da Feltre in 1425 firmly established in Harvard College in 1638, and in the College of William and Mary in 1693. And every institution of higher education founded within the United States after those dates seems, like Princeton College, to have received in the language of its charter a complete definition of its powers and its privileges, as having been erected “for the education of youth in the learned languages, and in the liberal arts and sciences.” When Franklin College was established, the articles of incorporation ran: “It is hereby enacted by the Representatives of the Freemen of Pennsylvania that there shall be, and hereby is, erected and established in the said borough of Lancaster in this state a college and charity school for the instruction of youth in the German, English, Latin, Greek, and other learned languages, in theology, and in the useful arts and sciences, and literature,” specific conditions involving specific changes—and when Franklin and Marshall College was dedicated in 1853 the wording of the articles of incorporation were practically the same.

If we ask what was the course of instruction authorized and imposed on these institutions by legislative enactment, it will be found to be as uniformly identical, so far as quality of material furnished to them by their several constituencies permitted, as was the wording of their charters—and, with the same proviso, identical also with the scheme of education developed so long before in Italy by Vittorino and his successors. That scheme did not aim at *instructing* the student, but at *developing* his nature, and that, not with a view to any special calling or purpose, in life, but with a view to making

of him a noble man, a good citizen, and so forming his character that all pure instincts and lofty aims should clothe him as an investiture from an ideal world to fit him for conduct in the real. The study of the classical literatures from the very beginning was made the basis of the system. Mathematics, it is true, as well as what passed for natural philosophy, music, social education and physical training, were not neglected, but the study of the classical languages and classical literatures was conceived to be the fundamental necessity of liberal culture. And it was felt and acknowledged from the first that of these two languages and literatures Greek was primary and all important. It did not need a Shelley to tell the educators of these four centuries that "in law, literature, religion, and art we are all Greeks," nor a Sir Henry Maine to affirm categorically that "not the law of the Romans, not the philosophy and sagacity of the Germans, not the luminous order of the French, not the political aptitude of the English, not that insight into physical nature to which all races have contributed, would apparently have come into existence," but for the Greeks; nor a President Andrews of more recent times to affirm that "No modern community, as a community, can dispense with Greek studies unless it elects to be barbaric." They experienced for themselves—these originators and founders of humanistic training—that no people stood in the same organic relation to all other peoples, at least of western Europe, as did the Greeks, and that for that reason no study can have the same uplifting and clarifying effect on those who experience its benefits.*

* "It is in this view of the matter that we get an explanation of the fact that the classical languages of antiquity afford better discipline, and are a more indispensable means of culture than any language of our own day except the language, the intimate language of our own thought, which is for us universal coin of exchange in the intellectual world, and must have its values determined to a nicety before we pay it out. No modern language is definite, classically made up. Modern tongues, moreover, carry the modern babel of voices. The thoughts they utter fluctuate and change; the phrases they speak alter and are dissolved with every change of current in modern thought or impulse. They have had, first

It will be found that in the history of Franklin and Marshall College the above statements receive abundant confirmation. From the only catalogue of Franklin College ever published we find the following scheme of Greek studies: *Greek Grammar and Lessons, Greek Reader, Xenophon's Anabasis, Homer's Odyssey, Herodotus, Euripides, Sophocles, Æschylus, Plato*. The first catalogue of Marshall College: For admission *Greek Grammar and Jacob's Greek Reader*; in course, *Xenophon's Anabasis, Homer's Iliad, Plato's Republic, Demosthenes' Oration on the Crown, Sophocles, Pindar, Greek Composition throughout the course, no Greek in the last term of the Senior year*. The first catalogue of Franklin and Marshall College gives: *Xenophon's Memorabilia, Homer's Iliad, Homer's Odyssey, Demosthenes' Oration on the Crown, Plato's Gorgias, Select Greek Tragedies, Pindar*. It will be seen that from the time of Professor Albert Smith, of Marshall College, in 1838, on down through the incumbency of Professor Wm. M. Nevin, 1840-1872, of Professor D. M. Wolff, 1873-1875, to that of Professor N. C. Schaeffer, 1876-77, the scheme of Greek studies was practically one and the same, the changes being but slight and such as the avoidance of monotony or the tastes of the several professors might suggest and justify.

or last, the same saturations of thought that our own language has had; they carry the same atmosphere; in traversing their pleasant territory, we see only different phases of our own familiar world, the world of our own experience; and valuable as is this various view of the world, it can be postponed. It is not fundamental. The classical literatures give us in tones and with an authentic accent we can nowhere else hear, the thought of an age we cannot visit. They contain airs of a time not our own, unlike our own, and yet our foster parent. To these things was the modern thinking world first bred. In them speaks a true, naïve, pagan, an early morning day when men looked upon the earth while it was fresh, untrodden by crowding thought, an age when the mind moved as it were without prepossessions, and with an unsophisticated, childlike curiosity, a season apart during which those seats upon the Mediterranean seem the first seats of thoughtful men. We shall not anywhere else get a substitute for it. The modern mind has been built upon that culture, and there is no authentic equivalent." Inaugural address, by Dr. Woodrow Wilson.

Later on an attempt was made to dwell at greater length on the history of the literature, and to create an interest in studying the details of Greek and Roman life in the classical period. But no decided departure from the accepted course of study was made until in 1895-6, when Greek was made elective in the senior year, and in 1899-1900 the same was done in the junior year. The study of Greek to the end of the Sophomore year was kept as a requisite condition for the first, or A.B., degree. This change may be regarded, and, indeed, was no doubt intended, not as a surrender of the claims of classical study in higher education, but as a closer determination of the relative amount of time they can justly claim in the curriculum. But as it was brought about in the way of a concession to young men who wished to gain a year's time in their professional studies by converting their senior year of undergraduate work into work in the scientific department which may be regarded as introductory to the study of medicine it seemed to aim at what is directly opposed to the underlying spirit and purpose of the American college as such. For this reason a few remarks on the general question of such a change may not be inappropriate here.

During the past generation a decided change has been taking place in respect to the position of classical studies. They have been, so to speak, on trial, and many sadly misguided and altogether inept attempts have been made—notably that of Mr. Charles Francis Adams—to bring them into disfavor. Many institutions of learning have restricted them, and others have made them entirely elective. The impelling cause of the movement doubtless was the clamorous insistency of other studies, ostensibly and immediately more useful, for consideration and place in the curriculum. But such a reason would not have been urged excepting by those who had an insufficient knowledge of the purposes of classical study—or who, for reasons more or less personal, were confounding the type of education for which the American college stands with another vastly different from it in scope and purpose.

While it is undoubtedly true, in a general sense, that all men would be made better by taking a course of study in college, it also is true that a college degree is a mint-mark of aristocracy in education, that the college is for the few, that in this respect as in so many others the great mass of men stand aloof, being hewers of wood and drawers of water, and that there will always be degrees, one may say, of nobility even amongst those who attain to eminence as educated men and women. In this country, however, the need of educated intelligence amongst the masses has led to the development of the public school system on a magnificent scale, and it has been felt that the education given there should have definitely in view the utilities of future life—and rightly so. This looks directly towards professional study, and that, as given in technological schools, and finally in universities. In other words, the university conception of education has come to have a great vogue in this country from perfectly natural causes. And this has been intensified and reinforced by another circumstance which should have had far less weight with our educated classes than it actually did have—viz., the prodigious prestige and influence of German universities with large numbers of our educated men and on our imported teachers. No fair-minded and well-informed man would seek to belittle the work done by these magnificent institutions, and they are right who say that if what they have done “were struck out of history the world would go back half a century.” Nevertheless, a distinction must be made. To admire their achievements and to substitute either their type of institution or their ideal in education for that of the American college, are two very different things. In the German system there is no intermediate period between boyhood and manhood. The German passes at a single leap from the one to the other, and acquires the view necessarily that the only intellectually valuable knowledge is such as is possessed by the specialist—a great mistake and a great evil! Is it too much to say that the rapacious brutality and the swashbuckling conceit with which the Germans were charged

in China, in Manila Bay, and in Venezuela would have been impossible if their educational system had not been shaped to suit the purposes of a strongly centralized government; and that English writers would not now be saying that the domestic sweetness and the simplicity of life once known in Germany have long since disappeared and a hard and selfish materialism has taken their place because the educational scheme in Germany has been manipulated by a calculating and somewhat whimsical Emperor? Whether so or not, large numbers of our educated people have for years been creating a disposition to shape our institutions of higher learning after those of Germany, and only within the last decade or two have begun to realize that the substitution of the University of Leipzig, or that of Berlin, for Harvard or for Yale would be a national disaster. And contemporaneously with this we find heads of institutions like Harvard or Columbia arguing in favor of a shortening of the college course in the interest of their professional schools, and maintaining the view that the educational value of all studies is practically the same, so that specialization along certain lines may be justifiably undertaken in undergraduate classes. In all this there is a strong tendency to bring the high school and the university into close, or immediate, touch, and the question "can the college survive?" becomes a very burning question, indeed. The only answer seems to be that as an independent institution it cannot possibly maintain itself, if it adopts the view and the practice prevailing between the university and the school. Both of these have a financial backing in the state which the college cannot secure; they both appeal for popular recognition to the fact that their educational scheme has the utilities of life directly in view; and they both are able to make a display of numbers which the old-time college cannot hope to match. But if the college should make prominent in all its work the type of education for which it was created, the answer might be very different. As originally designed, college training recognizes the need of a period of retirement from the world, as, to use the most note-

worthy examples, our Saviour did, when He withdrew to the wilderness, as St. Paul did when he went into the desert, or as the candidate for knightly honors did when he spent a season in self-consecration and prayer. It recognizes the absolute necessity for the growing man of a period of transition "when he is in the world but not exactly of the world, when he has a right to spend his time in becoming acquainted with the great heritage which has been bequeathed him before he is called upon to administer and improve it for his successors, when he can quietly explore various lines of thought and decide (if he can) in which one he can do the best service for himself and his generation." This is the most precious gift of the college as such to society—and above all to such a society as is found in England and in America. It is a gift which the university idea of education, in spite of all efforts to the contrary, tends to depreciate and to ignore—a gift which the college only can properly estimate and successfully bestow. But the moment this season of retirement for academic study is converted into a period of training in a specialty, the moment the undergraduate's attention is directed from a general preparation for life to the specific duties of life—that moment the preciousness of the gift begins to disappear, and a liberal education to be thrust aside by what is professional. The course of study in a college, therefore, should be general throughout, in as much as the combination of the two methods in one institution would be to throw a burden upon classical studies which they are but poorly fitted to endure. The average American boy is attracted by the plea that this or that course of study will get him ready for his life's work sooner than another, and usually he is filled with a great and feverish impatience to be, as he imagines, dealing with facts and amassing wealth. The justification of classical studies, on the other hand, is found only when his course in college is completed, and when the man realizes in his character what it is capable of doing in shaping a boy's destiny, and in equipping him for those duties in life which demand a broad and intelli-

gent view of what they involve and a sane balance and control of self in their treatment. Neither the plea that the maintenance of the classical course would reduce the numbers in attendance at college, nor the much-mooted matter of the advanced age at which our young men would thus be able to begin their particular work in life should have much weight in determining the question. Respecting the latter it may be said that young men once were able to take this identical course, and yet to be engaged in their professions by the age of twenty-two, or twenty-three. Whatever delay or postponement of professional careers may at present exist should therefore be looked for elsewhere than in college studies, and should be corrected where it is found. And in reply to the plea of reduced numbers of students it seems to be necessary only to point again to the fact that college studies were not originally and should not now be intended for the masses. Although it would be well if larger numbers could avail themselves of their undoubted benefits, it is nevertheless true that only relatively few will do so—the great majority finding utilitarian conceptions of education more to their mind. That great foster mother of education especially—the Christian church—needs to concern herself seriously about the kind of preparation ministers of the gospel are to receive. Ideality, unselfish devotion, many-sidedness in the power of thinking, breadth of sympathy, and loftiness of aim, are what they above all men should have—acquirements which would be unmeasured blessings if possessed by our lawyers, doctors, statesmen, and economists as well, but which are absolute necessities in the pulpit and at the altar. The old-time classical course was designed to impart these—did impart them through many generations. No other course of study has done anything in that direction to compare with it, and it is therefore not too much to say that the salvation of the American college, and of the higher and more liberalizing education, depends entirely on the preservation of these studies.

IV.

MATHEMATICS, PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY.

BY PROFESSOR JEFFERSON E. KERSHNER, PH.D.

So far as the writer of this recalls the history of Franklin and Marshall College these three departments were usually under the care of one man. If several men took part in the teaching of these branches not any one of them, nor even any two of them, were considered sufficient for one man's work because some other branches were united with one or other of them. This was particularly so until the time was reached when the college classes were so large that they were divided into sections. Also the introduction of the elective system brought in some new branches not taught before as separate branches, as, for instance, theory of equations including determinants, practical astronomy and physical measurements. The elective system also made it possible to enlarge the course in calculus to about double the number of hours of recitation and probably three times the amount of work both for student and professor, with, however, also the pleasant result that the present course is very much more congenial to both professor and student.

No doubt the best thing that an anniversary year can do for the small college is to call the attention of the institution and her friends, particularly, to the present and to the future. In public discussions and in the usual run of historical accounts of the past, we know full well the virtues and the powers for good of the small college are often most eloquently, and in many ways most justly, praised. However, in view of the spirit of combination and enlargement which is actually, not theoretically, going on in commerce, in the arts and in matters concerning education, it does appear that one line along which the small college has room to do the most

good is very much overlooked. No doubt the small college has been established and maintained for a purpose, and has a definite proposition before it which it ought to meet and satisfy. The praise and self-satisfaction that is often noticed in the small circles of the small college have, it is to be feared, a tendency to make even more sluggish the growth of the small institution. In view of this fear and in view of the fact that large institutions of magnificent proportions, magnificent equipments and magnificent facilities are now being established; or if already established are doubled and tripled in their proportions, it does seem that possibly also some advantages may belong to even these great educational concerns which are well worth noticing by the smaller institutions and their friends.

There is certainly one thing that the small college can do, that is, it can grow proportionately more than its larger neighbor into the usefulness of the community which it serves by increasing its equipments and facilities for good work as fast as possible. In view of the great competition among higher institutions, and in view of the fact that no doubt the college-university is to be preëminently the higher institution of learning in America, this matter of enlargement and advancement in equipment and in courses of study is very serious for any institution which aims to be in the rank of higher institutions of learning. There is serious danger that some who are too well satisfied with their past may wake up some day to find themselves in the ranks of what is the University of Chicago idea of the junior college; that is, a college that takes its students to about the junior class of our well-established college universities. Institutions of this kind would take a grade somewhat like that of the german gymnasium, possibly even a little lower than this. No doubt, however, all well-established colleges will want to do college work and not high-school work. In view of the continual increase in quantity and thoroughness of the high-school work the freshmen rank in college must also advance and that of other

classes in proportion. It is, therefore, doubtful whether a four years' course can be given which lies strictly within the older lines and definitions. Consequently there is much discussion going on now about three- or four-year college courses. However this question may be decided, it is a fact that great modifications and enlargements of studies in all courses have been introduced. Many elective studies are allowed, and, therefore, modifications of courses will naturally come in. Thus psychology to the extent offered or taught in the American college, ethics and æsthetics are largely university courses. So are analytical geometry and calculus, as well as physics, although physics is taught to some extent in the German gymnasium. Chemistry, biology and astronomy, as a rule, are given in two grades, the more advanced being more nearly of university grade than of gymnasium grade. Even the advance reading of pagan literature and the discussions of the literary character of these writings and their comparisons with modern literature is more characteristic of university work than of college work. No college can now be classed among the higher institutions of learning without in a large measure introducing the above electives. The fact that these courses do not conform strictly to the definitions and forms of old times does not change the facts. Neither is it necessary that American institutions should necessarily conform to the German system. There is no particular reason, if it suits the circumstances, why the Americans should not have a college-university in one institution. It may, indeed, be an advantage to have culture and at least semi-professional courses going on at the same time. But to do this, no doubt, more advanced work and more advanced equipment are required by institutions of this kind.

On account of these advanced requirements, no doubt, the importance of enlarging and of more efficiently equipping institutions can not be overestimated. Since the importance of growing more and more equal to the demands of the times is so great there are four events which have helped this depart-

ment more than any others which are purely historical. All honor to the men who served in it! No doubt they did well with what means they had. They did better work than many could have done who worked under later conditions. Those men were heroes in their day and generation.

But what of the future? The conditions are given, the courses required are here; whatever may be said for them or against them. The conditions must be met, for no small concern can change what the powerful and wealthy rivals have established.

There are four events that have helped and advanced the department of mathematics, physics and astronomy very much. These and these alone made it possible to improve the work and to enlarge the advantages of this department. The first of these is the founding of the (1) *Daniel Scholl Observatory*. The observatory was founded in 1884 by Mrs. James M. Hood, of Frederick, Maryland. The observatory contains apparatus gathered from all parts of the world. The eleven-inch Clark-Repsold equatorial contains a combination of the best workmanship of Europe and America. It is even now, eighteen years after it was constructed, visited and studied as the only instrument of its kind in America. The transit by Ertel and Son of Munich, the Fauth altitude and azimuth instrument are all well-selected instruments. This addition to the College did much to enlarge and to widen out the field of astronomical study as well as other lines of study. More than this, it enlarged the whole college plant at an early time when there seemed to be little hope of enlargement. It appears historically that astronomy is the starting point for all sciences. In itself the outcome may not be so great. Many of the newer sciences have become of much greater moment than astronomy. Still, just as the historical movement of science begins with astronomy, so it appears that the scientific departments of a college or university must go over somewhat the same steps. A first start is made in astronomy; and an observatory of less or greater extent makes the beginning, and then follow other

departments; more physics and chemistry, better geology and even more biological and social science. When an observatory even is only used for purposes of teaching, the very fact that the student comes in contact with the problems as they arise in the observatory and with the bodies constituting the stellar universe, enlarges his views of these matters. It broadens and heightens his conceptions of the magnitude of the objects studied and of the skill and powers of man who produces the apparatus, as well of those who discover and demonstrate the laws and principles underlying either the instruments or the bodies and their motions and conditions as they constitute a part or all of the universe.

These larger and wider views cannot be acquired from books alone. Reading alone cannot produce great men in any time. Men must come into contact, or even into conflict, with something from without, whether this be material, energy or social forces. It was, therefore, a great addition to the college to have founded an observatory, and as it was really the first significant step towards the greater Franklin and Marshall, too much praise cannot be given to the person who gave of her means to found the observatory, as well as to the heroic support given by other friends, several of whom have now passed away, who took great interest in making the observatory a large and more permanent factor in the affairs of the college.

(2) The next event that helped along the general department of mathematics, physics and astronomy is that the Board of Trustees wisely allowed a sum of money, although small, to be annually applied to the purchase of physical apparatus. Physics is fundamental to astronomy, and in a very important sense fundamental to all science. However, it is historically true that the physical laboratory was late in its development. This is not only true of our college, but it is so even in the great foreign universities, as well as in the great college-universities of America. At Berlin the regular university physical laboratory was only opened in 1863. At Heidelberg in 1846-50. The University of Glasgow only started its labora-

tory in 1845 with Lord Kelvin (Sir William Thomson) as professor of physics, in a few rooms in an old wine cellar which was then only the private laboratory of Lord Kelvin. Only so late as 1870 was a regular university physical laboratory established. We give a few of these examples to show that physics, although developed along with chemistry as an experimental science, had, nevertheless, a long time to wait until laboratories for study and investigation of physical problems were established. It was, therefore, a great step in advance to get ready for a separate physical laboratory in our college. The apparatus purchased was used to give general demonstrations to classes in the general course in physics. Also such work as could be done in the way of physical measurements, that is, work by students was undertaken. This, in the nature of the case, was somewhat meager, both because of the limited supply of apparatus and the still more needed room in which to do such work.

(3) However, still better days were to come. These came with the new Science Building, which is the third epoch-making event in this department and, indeed, in the college. In fact this is by far the greatest and most important step taken in the interest of the greater Franklin and Marshall. The rooms devoted to the department of higher mathematics and physics are ample and well appointed. However, it must be admitted that, while there is some apparatus that was obtained in the way related above, it is not equal to the demands of the department or the room for its use.

More is expected of colleges, or rather of the American college-university, as the higher institution of learning, than formerly. The high schools and academies are doing much of the work that used to be college work. If the four years' course is to be maintained necessarily branches or extensions of work in certain branches must be introduced, and are continually introduced. While this is sometimes questioned, it is quite certain that all that has been introduced is quite as much in place as anything that tradition has kept in the course; that

is several thousand years old and in addition is pagan in its forms and ideals. The facts are that more is required and equipments and men must be provided to meet the demands.

It is, therefore, greatly to be desired that the physical laboratory be more fully equipped in two directions. One is for purposes of general demonstrations such as a general course in physics requires. The other is for purposes of more advanced work in physical measurements undertaken by the students themselves. The latter work is very highly necessary to train students in habits of accuracy, as well as to lead students to careful and unbiased independent thought. It develops a soberness of mind which will heroically attack any new problems not by sentimental and impracticable methods but by well-considered and certain methods, which, in whatever calling the application may be made, will lead to correct, fruitful and good results.

(4) The latest addition to the department is the strength and assistance brought to it by the generous, and, at the same time, most important addition to the college, the temporary endowment of the professorship of modern languages by a distinguished member of the Board of Trustees. By this addition of one man to the faculty the department of natural science was relieved and some time given to the department of mathematics that was formerly used for modern languages and literature. This made it possible to divide the classes into two sections, and also made it possible to carry on more effectually the electives, calculus, general and practical astronomy, as well as made room for the introduction of a short course in theory of equations involving determinants. Also descriptive geometry and a short course in rational mechanics were introduced, as there was a call for these branches, by students who found special interest in a more advanced pursuit of the mathematics, particularly in their applications to problems growing out of equilibrium of forces or of the motions produced by them.

It will be observed in view of all that has been reviewed

above that considerable has been added to the strength of the college in this department. But still more is needed. This is no time to rest on our oars. More apparatus or larger working forces of professors is needed, for, as before stated, in view of the great increase of the scope and the equipment of the high schools below and the great college-universities which lead and set the pace for the higher institutions of learning, vastly more is expected of our college than formerly, and the equipments and the men must, therefore, be provided. We will not undertake to say here exactly how much a small institution can do or must do, but one thing is certain, that it must do a great many things that it did not need to do in the past. It must, therefore, look to the future and provide for the future; for while it is true substantial progress has been made, it is also true that progress always makes corresponding demands upon the friends and supporters of our department as well as of our institutions.

V.

THE NATURAL SCIENCES THEN AND NOW.

BY RICHARD C. SCHIEDT.

If it is true that the efficiency and reputation of an institution of learning largely depend upon the high quality of its teaching force, Franklin College from the very beginning must certainly have stood in the very front rank of America's educational establishments. For it had in its faculty at the outset men of national reputation in almost every department of instruction. Preëminent among them were undoubtedly Muehlenberg and Melsheimer, two men who occupied the foremost positions among the naturalists of this country. The *Rev. G. H. E. Muehlenberg* not only descended from an illustrious family, but added now luster to the name of his sires through the eminent services which he rendered his country in the domain of natural history, especially in botany. The problems which confronted the American naturalists of that time were not so much of a scientific as of a practical nature. To collect and determine the native flora of this vast continent constituted the chief task of the botanist; he was primarily the foundation builder, the pioneer and pathfinder for a new race of scientific interpreters. But Muehlenberg did a great deal more. He was undoubtedly the first American botanist who took a keen interest in the profounder, specifically scientific problems which were agitating the leading European schools of botanists. Since 1750 Linnæus' binary method of naming the various species of plants, i. e., the combination of genus and species terms, had come into general use, and forthwith the merit of a botanist was measured by the number of species which he had collected or with which he was acquainted. This state of affairs lasted for fully a hundred years, leading gradually to an insipid dilettantism which

brought the study of botany into disrepute among scientific men. It is, therefore, all the more to the credit of Muehlenberg that he was one of the first to break away from this slavish traditionalism and turned his attention to the profounder aims of Linnæus, who had looked upon his artificial classification as a mere makeshift to be superseded by a natural system, the adoption of which should be the highest goal of every true botanist. A new direction was given to the study of systematic botany and morphology in 1789, when two Frenchmen, Bernard de Jussieu and especially his nephew, Antoine Laurent de Jussieu, following Linnæus, published the *Genera Plantarum*, the first attempt at a natural classification. This occurred only two years after the opening of Franklin College. It augured well for the new institution to have entered upon its career at the dawn of a new era in the realm of the natural sciences. The new botany demanded a more exact inquiry into the organization of plants, and especially into the structure of the organs of fertilization, all of which involved new methods of inductive investigation. But as long as the firm belief in the dogma of the constancy of species, as defined by Linnæus, remained the foundation upon which systematists built, so long the idea of natural relationship remained a mystery and no scientific meaning could be attached to this mysterious conception; and yet the farther the inquiry into affinities proceeded the more definitely were all the relations developed which connected together species, genera and families. The chief merit of Antoine de Jussieu lay in his success of providing the families with characters, and introducing larger groups which he named classes, thus laying the foundation for all further advance in the natural method of classification. Muehlenberg evidently followed the new tendencies in botanical science very cautiously, but more keenly than the vast majority of his European cotemporaries, so that the change from the Linnæan system to that of Jussieu, which he finally resolved upon, was made rather abruptly. His *Catalogus Plantarum Americæ Septentrionalis*, published

in Lancaster as late as 1813, still follows the Swedish master, but only two years later it is succeeded by the *Reduction of all the Genera of Plants contained in the "Catalogus Plantarum" of Muehlenberg to the Natural Families of De Jussieu's System* (Philadelphia, 1815). This was certainly a remarkable step in advance, when we consider that in Germany the Linnæan system was still followed in the ordinary text-books at the time when the writer of this article first studied botany. The same mark of advanced knowledge is found throughout the last one of Muehlenberg's works, published in Philadelphia two years after his death, in 1817, entitled *Descriptio uberior Graminum et Plantarum Calamariarum America Septentrionalis Indigenarum et Circurum*. No wonder that the Lancaster preacher and professor was "acknowledged by scientists in America and Europe as maintaining the highest rank. Various plants discovered and classified by him were named in his honor. He corresponded with the highest authorities in this and other sciences and was visited, among others, by Alexander von Humboldt and Aimé Bonpland. He was a member of the American Philosophical Society, of the philosophical and physical societies of Göttingen and Berlin, and other scientific societies in Germany, Sweden and other countries."*

The same high praise may be given to the Rev. *Frederick Valentine Melsheimer*, who taught in Franklin College from 1787 to 1790. He is known as the "earliest local entomologist in this country," and his *Catalogue of the Insects of Pennsylvania* (1806) is the first American work of note on this subject. He is still quoted by the present generation of entomologists—as, e. g., by Thomas Say and Packard—who respect his observations in many cases as final. He lived at a time when Cuvier's authority reigned supreme in the realm of animal study, and the system of classification was still more artificial than in botany, but it was also a time when the first valuable observations on the pollination of flowers by insects

* Appleton's "Encyclopædia of American Biography."

were published and the first suggestions on the theory of descent, derived from these studies, were uttered. Entomology then began to gain recognition as a science worthy of a place in the college curriculum.

But from all we can learn, Franklin College as such did not derive an adequate benefit from the renown of its professors. It lived the life of a small preparatory school in a small country town. Even the kindly assistance of the mighty Ben Franklin himself could not change its slow trend of existence. The conditions of its environment were against phenomenal success such as the reputation of the professors would warrant. The country at large was called upon to lay the foundations of the newly-born republic, and the colonies struggled towards organization into sovereign states. Whatever a large-hearted generosity had to give was needed for the immediate development of national resources and the so-called charity schools had to be satisfied with the crumbs that fell from the masters' tables. Moreover, the study of the humanities in the scholastic sense overshadowed all else in the curriculum of the colleges; hardly more than the merest rudiments was attempted in the teaching of natural history, and I doubt whether the professors themselves ever considered it worth while to arouse any interest for their hobbies among the students. Such men as Priestly, Muehlenberg and Melsheimer, were, therefore, more ornamental than useful in the eyes of the educational authorities, while the men who occupied in those days the throne of thinkers, the champions of the much-lauded nature philosophy, assumed a condescending air of pity for all and every one who penetrated into nature's hidden resources with scalpel, microscope and scales instead of seeking the solution of the great problems within the recesses of their own inner consciousness.

But the influence of a Muehlenberg and a Melsheimer was, nevertheless far reaching and permanent both for Franklin College and the nation at large. The spirit of men who have touched the eternal and unlocked the secret treasure

houses of the universe remains throughout the ages as an ever present, active, subtle force within the domain of its erstwhile manifestation. The name and fame of our two earliest pioneers in the realm of the natural sciences have clung tenaciously to the history of Franklin College and of Pennsylvania alike. Many a keen observing mind came under the influence, directly or indirectly, silently and perhaps unconsciously, of the sages who taught in that little college by the Conestoga Creek. From Lancaster, Philadelphia and elsewhere young men, and women too, started out to study the beautiful stretch of land which God had given them, and if we dare rely upon the records of the carefully written book "The Botanists of Philadelphia and its Environment" we can point with pride to Muehlenberg and Melsheimer as the true founders of the now famous "Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences." These two men call to my mind the personality of their friend Alexander von Humboldt, that remarkable man of universal genius, who walked in and out at the court of Frederick William IV. of Prussia like a Mephistopheles, meditating now aloud and now in silence, and yet ruling his cotemporaries as the king in the realm of knowledge, embodying within himself the entire exact science of his age, laying foundations and making pathways for others, inspiring not only naturalists but philosophers also. Just as his *Cosmos* stands at the beginning of the new scientific period of the last century as a warning against a one-sided specialism, so also does the literature of our two American pioneers remind us of the fact that their influence was so universal because their interests were so universally human. They touched men in many ways and thereby gained a hearing for their specific mission.

Scarcely five years after Muehlenberg's last publication had made its appearance, dealing more minutely with the North American grasses, and giving a new impetus to the study of this rather difficult subject, there was born in a small village in the Allegheny Mountains a boy who was destined to come

under the inspiring influence of the first great American botanist and to take up his work, a pupil fully worthy of his master. Another preacher-scientist had arisen in the Providence of God and had finally—shall we say led by the spirit of his master?—found his way first to Marshall and then to Franklin and Marshall College. Fifty years ago on the very threshold of the rejuvenated life of the old Franklin College we meet a second Muehlenberg in the person of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Porter, Professor of the Natural Sciences in the new twin college at Lancaster. Many were the changes which had taken place since the days of 1787; science had undergone a complete revolution, but the essential work of the master of those days still formed the foundation upon which his disciples built. In the years immediately before and after 1840 a new life had begun to stir in all the branches of botanical research, including anatomy, physiology and morphology. Von Mohl had restored the study of anatomy and Naegeli had founded and elaborated the theory of cell formation, made possible by the introduction of the greatly improved microscopes. Morphology was, therefore, in a position to renew its investigations into the sexuality of plants and into embryology, enlarging at the same time its field of research so as to include not only the phanerogams but also the higher and lower cryptogams. The results of these investigations were embodied in Endlicher's great systematic work on the *Genera plantarum secundum ordines naturales*, published in 1840, and closely followed by Asa Gray, Bentham and Hooker. Gray of Harvard had published his *Elements of Botany*, his *Flora of North America* and his *Manual of the Botany of the Northern United States*, when Porter entered upon his work in Marshall College. His aim was from the beginning "the collecting and critical study of the plants of his native state," to which he had assiduously devoted himself since 1840, and with this definite aim in view his class-room work constantly received a new impetus and fresh inspirations. Franklin and Marshall College became the center of a new activity. The Linnæan

Society was organized and many prominent citizens and educators from Lancaster and its environment were sufficiently stimulated by Dr. Porter to coöperate with him in investigating the flora and fauna of the county and in giving the natural sciences a more prominent place in the curriculum of all the schools. Many an authority and many a lover of plant life in Pennsylvania and elsewhere owes his first awakening in that direction to Dr. Porter. The botanical collections of the Academy of the Natural Sciences in Philadelphia received his careful attention and Dr. Asa Gray was in constant communication with him relative to the progress of the *Synoptical Flora of North America*, while Dr. Torrey added numerous specimens to the herbarium of Columbia University through the courtesy of Dr. Porter. Dr. Britton, of the New York Botanical Garden, perhaps the most eminent American systematic botanist of the present day, says in the biography from which many of the preceding and following facts are taken, that Dr. Porter's knowledge of plant habitats and environment drawn from many years of close observation was remarkable. Over and over again he would remark that a locality visited for the first time was a "likely place" for certain species to grow and the chances were all in favor of the plant being found within the next few minutes.* Possessing to a high degree the power of the true educator to arouse enthusiasm, he became naturally a most generous coöperator of other students of botany. As early as 1846 he explored northern Georgia in company with the noted naturalist, Dr. Joseph Le Conte, of Philadelphia, and the collection of botanical specimens which he then brought back became the nucleus of his general herbarium for which he personally collected in all parts of the United States, adding at the same time numerous specimens from Europe by exchange, so that this herbarium became one of the most noteworthy collections of plants in the country. It contains the records of his important pioneer work in the study of the Rocky Mountain flora in connection with the United States

* *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club*, July, 1901, pp. 369-373.

Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories in 1869-74 under Dr. F. V. Hayden and these specimens are, according to Dr. Britton, historically important inasmuch as comparatively few duplicates were obtained. His generous coöperation is also acknowledged by the same biographer in the collection of materials for the Preliminary Catalogue of New Jersey Plants, published by the Geological Survey of the state in 1880. This coöperation continued for ten subsequent years, during which the exploration of the state of New Jersey was going forward, and when, in 1890, Dr. Britton began his monumental work embodied in the *Illustrated Flora of the Northern United States*, Dr. Porter naturally was one of the chief advisers and coworkers. "In recognition of Dr. Porter's services to botanical science the genera *Porterella* in the Lobeliaceæ and *Porteranthus* in the Rosaceæ have been dedicated to him, and more than thirteen species or subspecies of as many genera. Among his published botanical papers which include over fifty titles the descriptions of new species belonging to twenty-two different genera occupy a prominent place."

But Dr. Porter was not a one-sided specialist. Upon him had fallen the mantle of Muehlenberg and of Melsheimer; he had caught the inspiration of an Alexander von Humboldt. Dr. J. N. Dubbs, another one of his biographers, who has kindly permitted me to make use of his data, says of him in this connection: "For years it was his duty to give his pupils some idea of several of the natural sciences, and with earnest and self-sacrificing labor he traversed an enormous field." Both in geology and zoölogy he contributed many new facts to students and investigators of his acquaintance, and what that meant we can only fully appreciate when we consider that both these sciences had been thoroughly revolutionized respectively by Lyell and by Charles Darwin, every new discovery being closely scrutinized in the light of the new evolution. This power of his influence upon students can perhaps be best measured by the success of two later graduates of Franklin and

Marshall College, who not in the class-room, indeed, but in field excursions were under the spell of his master mind, viz., his nephew, Dr. John K. Small, of the New York Botanical Garden, and Mr. A. A. Heller, the ardent collector. The former is now editing his uncle's life work, the *Flora of Pennsylvania*, while busy at the same time with the completion of his great work on the *Flora of the Southeastern United States*, which covers some 1,400 pages, ready for publication by the end of April. Although hardly thirty-five years of age, Dr. Small's contributions to botanical science represent already about eighty titles, the last one of which, just mentioned, will be one of the most voluminous classics in American botany.

Unfortunately Dr. Porter's connection with Franklin and Marshall College ended as far back as 1866, when he was called to a professorship of the Natural Sciences in his alma mater, Lafayette College. Yet his influence remained; the spirit and flavor of his activity were transmitted to his successor, Dr. Stahr, and year after year, when the meadows and woods would renew their beautiful spring garments a band of Franklin and Marshall students could be seen week after week roaming through hill and valley in search after knowledge and plants. Dr. Porter's kindly interest contributed also in other ways. He helped to lay the foundations for our herbarium, contributing largely himself and urging others to do likewise, carrying on an uninterrupted correspondence with Dr. Stahr until the time of his death in 1901.

When we come to estimate the part which the natural sciences played on the curriculum of Franklin and Marshall College under Dr. Porter and his successor, we must not forget that philosophy and the humanities in the scholastic sense still occupied by far the greater portion of the students' time, and the dictum of the old school of nature philosophy and of Hegel's idealism for experimental science largely prevailed in the thought of the institution. It required all the power of Dr. Porter's poetic genius and all his love for the profound problems of the purely idealistic tendencies of his environ-

ment to reconcile the opposite currents and to inspire his students with that love for the beautiful in nature which was so particularly his own. That he succeeded admirably in many cases has already been shown, and the subsequent history amply warrants the assertion that to him must be accorded the palm of having given natural history an abiding place in the curriculum of the twin college, such as it never had held before the union.

But while it was clearly necessary on this side of the Atlantic that naturalists should carefully study and collect the material which constituted our fauna and flora, before the ever-increasing immigration from other continents would distort their native character, the problem had become a different one in Europe. Sachs, the eminent botanist, says in his *History of Botany* (pp. 186, etc.): "It is true that eminent service was rendered in the several domains of systematic botany, morphology, anatomy and physiology"—"but there was no one to put together, to criticise and apply the knowledge which had been accumulated in all parts of the science; no one really knew what a wealth there was at that time of important facts; least of all was it possible to form a judgment on the matter from the text-books of the period, which were deficient in ideas and facts, and crammed with a superfluous terminology." "This was the evil result of the old and foolish notion that the sole or chief business of every botanist is to trifle away time in plant-collecting in wood and meadow and in rummaging in herbaria." "Such a condition of things is dangerous for every science; of what profit is it that single men of superior merit advance this or that part of the science, when a connected view of the whole is wanting, and the beginner has no opportunity of studying the best things in their mutual relation." Practically the same conditions prevailed in zoölogy before Darwin's day. The right man to speak the redeeming word for botany appeared in the person of Professor Schleiden, of the University of Jena. He had become favorably known through his important researches

in anatomy and embryology, especially dealing with the development of the ovule before fertilization, but his great work was his text-book of general botany, which appeared in a series of editions from 1842 to 1848, marking an epoch in botanical literature. It was iconoclastic throughout and aroused tremendous excitement by its fullness of life and thought. Its chief title, *Botany as an Inductive Science*, indicates the point on which the author laid most stress; henceforth botany was to become a real science, holding the same place as physics and chemistry, in which the spirit of genuine inductive enquiry into nature had already asserted itself in opposition to the nature-philosophy of the immediately preceding years; and botany did become, all at once, a science rich in subject matter. Schleiden was followed by Carl Naegeli, a man of a very different character of mind, whose researches from this time onward laid the foundations of knowledge in every department of botany. He, for the first time, proceeded from simple and plain facts to the more difficult, *i. e.*, he not only discarded the old method of merely dissecting phanerogamous plants and centering all botanical knowledge around this mechanical grind, but he introduced the cryptogams into the field of systematic investigation and made them its starting point. Thus morphology secured a foundation in exact historical development, inasmuch as phanerogams were now examined by the light of the history of development in the cryptogams. This first innovation was followed by a second, when Naegeli made the new doctrine of the cell the starting point of morphology by showing that the first commencement of organs and their further growth must be traced back to the formation of separate cells. We cannot go here into details, suffice it to say that the study of the cell became the chief interest of investigators and led to the proper establishment of histology on the one hand and to the full understanding of the lowest plants, the Thallophytes, on the other. And what was true of botany was in a still higher degree true of zoölogy. Since Karl Ernst von Baer had laid

the foundations of modern embryology and Schwann had stimulated the best minds to study the animal cell anew, the life history of the individual became more and more understood and systematic zoölogy was gradually transformed into scientific morphology, especially so since Johannes Mueller, the father of modern physiology, had published his epoch-making work on the Myxinoidea. With such a mass of facts drawn from anatomy, physiology, morphology and biology zoölogy had reached the stage where it found it necessary to generalize and establish laws, which was first undertaken by Charles Darwin in his famous book *On the Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection* in 1859.

Before Darwin the universally accepted theory of the constancy of the species of both animals and plants had seriously interfered with the establishment of a satisfactory system of a natural classification. When this stumbling block had been removed, in theory at least, a whole flood of new investigations, morphological, embryological, physiological, swept over the field of scientific controversy, and the battle for the new inductive science began in full force. Darwin was not a systematist, nor a morphologist, nor a physiologist, he was the great exponent of a science for which the name ecology was adopted only later on. He did not deal with things dried in the herbarium or pickled in alcohol or formalin, but with things living, living in their own way, and he lived with them in sympathy and coöperation, making them unfold secrets to him which they would tell no other, because he only could understand. But in the laboratory the tests for the observations on the living forms had to be made, viz., the relations of structure to function had to be established, life histories, i. e., the development of species from egg to adult form, had to be investigated, and functions in relation to the modification of organs, respectively to environment-influences had to be tested. All that involved the introduction and invention of new forms of apparatus, the erection of new buildings, and a thoroughgoing change in text-books and curricula of col-

leges and universities. The Darwinian ideas transformed the thought world in more than one way. Now stress was laid on minute anatomy, now on embryology, now on studies in variations under the influence of environment, and again on cellular physiology, until to-day all these studies are brought to bear on Darwin's original methods, viz., the so-called ecological methods, including plant and animal distribution, geographically and geologically, and organic associations with their causes. What Lamarck and Darwin had uttered in theory DeVries has recorded as actual facts. He has positively demonstrated the origin of various species of plants, only in his case they were "evolved, as he puts it, with a sudden leap," not as a result of selection or the struggle for existence. The results of all the experimental work are to-day applied with marked success to the problems of reforesting the devastated sections of the country, so vigorously carried on even in the United States. In the educational world the new inductive science has become the most robust interpreter of human life, the new humanitas.

But the new botany and zoölogy found its way across the Atlantic at a comparatively late date. This was chiefly due to the fact that our institutions of learning were not adapted to such experimental work. The old prescribed curriculum of the colleges was only calculated for routine work, and universities in the European, especially German, sense, with their freedom for investigation, their vast apparatus and monetary support did not exist. Only after a few enlightened wealthy men had given liberally of their means and assisted in the establishment of real universities was it possible to introduce modern inductive science into our curricula. But when the beginning was once made universities sprang up all over the land like mushrooms. In our own case the changes were in the nature of the case very gradual. Guided by an extremely conservative policy and influenced by an inherited prejudice against anything that had not vegetated in our inner consciousness for some time and smacked after the

experimental and materialistic, our counsellors allowed but very hesitatingly the introduction of the new methods and ideas, and our men of means were allowed to die without remembering the old college sufficiently in their wills to enable it to keep up the pace with institutions of the same age and prestige.

I remember when Dr. Stahr handed over to me the burden of his many departments, in order to go out and arouse the church to the full consciousness of her duty and to enable his successors to enjoy the privileges which had been denied him, how disparagingly any innovation was received in many quarters, especially so within our own inner circle. However, we were among the first of the Pennsylvania colleges to attempt the introduction of laboratory methods into our curriculum about a dozen years ago, without perhaps fully foreseeing the changes this innovation would involve. Two hours of recitation per week for one whole year covered the allowance for the study of zoölogy and botany; the same amount of time was granted to chemistry and geology. How ridiculous it seemed to force laboratory methods within such narrow limits. But then there were so many afternoons in the week not provided for by the schedule, and neither library nor gymnasium to while away the time. Here was our opportunity. We faithfully assigned the lessons in the text-books for the two hours of recitation and called for volunteers in the afternoon to assist in some primitive experiment. We had one second-hand binocular microscope around which a half a dozen zealous sophomores and some higher classmen would gather to learn something of that wonderful cell life of which the books spoke. We walked by faith and saw but little. By and by there came a new impetus. Dr. Stahr had secured a handsome contribution from the Eyerman family of the First Easton Reformed Church, and we were enabled to add something in the shape of a chemical laboratory to the rear of one of the wings of recitation hall. That wonderful addition, which took the place of a dingy little den called by

the ambiguous name of "the Professor's Laboratory," deranged the limitations of the time-honored schedule as it had the professor's laboratory. Two additional hours of special laboratory work in chemistry were added or rather allowed for attendance was not yet obligatory. But this new activity with its novel experiences gave also a new inspiration to the department of natural history. We took courage and went out among a few friends, chiefly those who had always given when asked, and presented the needs of the biological branches. About a thousand dollars were collected and the biological laboratory became a fact. A half dozen microscopes, a microtome, paraffine bath and a new table of inordinate length provided with many drawers constituted the new equipment. A few more afternoon hours were allowed and Saturday morning was added to the optional schedule. One of our ardent desires was now fulfilled, we had succeeded in establishing the modern workshop spirit, that knows no schedule limits, within our college walls. There was a close fellowship between the chemical and biological laboratories which found its proper expression in the exchange of utensils and strong odors. These departments were still under one head, but the crowding of additional hours and the necessity of dividing the classes into sections demanded an increase in the teaching force, and with that came of course the desire for separate and enlarged quarters. With the help of one of our own post-graduate students we were enabled to carry on this coöperative housekeeping in a few adjoining rooms for a few years longer, and it is worthy of note that the first post-graduate work in the college pursued in the biologic-chemical section bore its immediate fruit and was to us of immense advantage, since we could have hardly called in a stranger under the circumstances. Our outside influence had likewise changed. We were called upon to render definite practical service to the community and the state, and in the larger scientific world we had the honor of being among the first colleges represented in the now world-renowned Marine Biological Labora-

tory of Woods Hole, Mass. The new inductive methods also required new text-books, written just for our purposes and our limited time, which burden had to be assumed by the professor in charge with no remuneration other than the satisfaction of having our own text-books introduced in a few of the larger universities, among which was the University of Pennsylvania, whose biologists invited the writer to coöperate in the original investigations carried on in the new marine biological laboratory at Sea Isle City. All this happened between the years 1890 and 1900. Gradually the equipments had been enlarged, we had acquired some twenty microscopes and even a fine projection apparatus for ordinary lantern slides, with the aid of which we attempted popular illustrated lectures on scientific topics.

Gradually but surely a change had come over the old curriculum, the demand for electives had to be granted and, among others, a few concessions were made to the higher biological branches, notably in human anatomy and histology, in order to enable our graduates to accept the opportunity, offered by the medical colleges to advanced men, of entering the second year of their course. Finally, the time was ripe for a separate science course with a specific degree. The separation, in theory at least, is now an accomplished fact; we have many candidates for the degree of A.B. and a few for that of Ph.B., but the proportions are gradually becoming less abnormal. The chief difficulty lies in our great lack of teaching forces, which has hitherto made the grouping system impossible. What we need above all things is to lay a much greater emphasis upon the modern languages, especially in the science course. For years past these languages were a mere adjunct of the department of the natural sciences or *vice versa*. Happily also in this respect an almost complete separation has taken place; we have a distinct chair of modern languages, but its privileges have not increased one iota. The post-graduate university courses in the natural sciences demand thorough familiarity with German and French, yet such

a preparation is clearly impossible with the time allotted in our schedule to these languages. Practically the same is true of the various scientific branches. We still cling to the old two-hour recitation credits of years ago, and as long as a student, *e. g.*, in analytical chemistry only, receives credit for one hour's work, when he has to spend at least six hours in the laboratory, so long can we not expect to build up a department which will be selected by a large number of earnest young men. Our whole system needs a thorough-going revolution in this respect.

Our fondest hopes have been realized; the first efforts of our former Financial Secretary, the Rev. Ambrose Schmidt, to interest a few Pittsburg gentlemen then members of our Board of Trustees in a new Science Hall have been crowned with abundant success. The quondam dingy laboratory in the old recitation hall has evolved through many stages into the magnificent Science Building; the names of Baer, Wolff, Hershey, Rengier and others have shed new luster upon our past scientific achievements; our opportunities are equal to those of the best institutions of the land. Will we, can we realize that this is the time of our salvation? Without a larger endowment our new Science Hall will be of little more use than were the old cramped quarters. It devolves upon our friends to make the coming semicentennial an occasion of large, liberal offerings, to place at the disposal of the authorities at least \$100,000 for present needs, and to devise means for an additional \$250,000 to carry out the most conservative injunctions of our God-given mission.

The sciences have now entered the ranks of the humanities; their cost is justified by their contributions to the betterment of human life. The purely systematic work which prevailed in the natural sciences in former days has been supplemented by the laboratory, and the two are now combined to furnish a proper interpretation of our environment in the new science of *Ecology*. The two phases of study are of equal importance; they are represented in our new science

building; they are embodied in the history of the natural science studies in Franklin and Marshall College. Sanitary science, medicine, agriculture, horticulture and forestry are the practical applications of their principles. Though ever upholding the ideal we need not apologize for pointing to the practical value of these branches of scientific work. "Service first wrung from the unwilling slave, then the free-will offering of the citizen and patriot, is now the honorable goal of the worker in science, and there is no higher end to be attained."

VI.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AT FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL.

BY PROFESSOR C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

To write a paper on the teaching of English at Franklin and Marshall without some opening words of tribute to the memory of William Marvel Nevin would be a singularly ungracious thing. So long ago as 1840 Professor Nevin entered the service of Marshall College at Mercersburg, occupying while there the chair of Ancient Languages and Belles Lettres. In 1853, when the change came, he was reëlected to the same position in Franklin and Marshall College, carrying on the work of the two departments until 1872, when, by the spontaneous action of the alumni, a new chair was established for him, to be known as the Alumni Chair of English Literature and Belles Lettres. The endowment was only about half completed; but Professor Nevin, nevertheless, enjoyed for just twenty years the distinction of being the Alumni Professor of English Literature and Belles Lettres. And how well the old-fashioned, dignified title, "Professor of Belles Lettres," became him! It was an appellation rightly reserved for him alone. In February, 1892, old and full of days, rich in experience and crowned with honor, he passed to his reward.

For fifty-two years this justly venerated man had served the institutions of the church. In the college chapel the students of to-day may see, in the handsome and sweet-toned organ, a fitting memorial to him. The students of former days, at old Marshall College and at Franklin and Marshall from '53 on down, need no such memorial and no words from me to keep alive the memory of William Marvel Nevin. His winsome personality lives in their hearts; the compelling

power of his gentle, courteous nature is a cherished influence in their daily lives.

It was not my good fortune to be a student of Professor Nevin's; but it was my privilege, and I counted it a rare one even then, to know him as a man during the three years of my Seminary career (1885-88). In his family and social relations a more lovable man, I am sure, never lived. The singular sweetness of his nature, refined by age and always enlivened by a gentle, playful humor, won all who ever came close enough to feel the subtle influence. It is eminently fitting that the alumni should unite, at the coming jubilee celebration, in some formal tribute to the memory of this "Honored Teacher," this "Cultivated Scholar," this "Polished Gentleman," this "Humble Christian," this "Man Without Guile"—William Marvel Nevin, LL.D.

After Professor Nevin's death, in February, 1892, the work of the English department was carried on for a year and a half by Professor George F. Mull, assisted by Mr. William M. Irvine, then about completing his theological course in the Seminary, and since 1893 the well-known and successful President of Mercersburg Academy. In June, 1893, the Board of Trustees elected to the vacant chair the present incumbent, designated in *The Annual Register*: Professor of the English Language and Literature. I entered upon my duties in September, 1893, and am, therefore, about completing my tenth academic year. During this period certain changed conditions, due to the increase in the size of classes (compelling a division into sections) and the introduction of electives, have made necessary several alterations, which I shall note in passing.

It has always been felt, I think, that there is a vital relation between the department of English and the other departments at Franklin and Marshall. It is essential that this should be so; that good, idiomatic English be insisted on in both written and oral work throughout the several departments. That much may be done for English in the study

of the classics no one will gainsay. In the great public schools of England, and notably Winchester, the writing of English is taught almost entirely by the carefully done translations from the classics constantly required in all "the forms." It is held by English educators that no training in the use of a vocabulary and the cultivation of a respectable, adequate style can compare with that gained by such systematic drill in the rendition of the Greek and Roman authors. Even metrical translations from the classic poets are frequently required, as a training not only in form but in precision and flexibility of expression. So, too, in the papers required in the Modern History School at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, students get a vast amount of drill in the writing of firm, sure, well-bred English prose—the sort one reads in the two great reviews, *The London Quarterly* and *The Edinburgh*.

It is, perhaps, not generally recognized that philosophy and science have much in common with finish or distinction of prose style; and yet, where will you find these qualities more strikingly displayed than in the prose of Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and our own John Fiske? It is gratifying in this connection to note that the head of the chemical department at one of our Eastern universities, a distinguished teacher and untiring investigator, is as great a stickler for good English prose as any member of the Faculty of Arts. He will not accept, in the written work submitted to him, a paper that is characterized in any way by confusion of arrangement, obscurity of construction, or slovenliness of expression. It must be rewritten, and must come up to Doctor A—'s standard, before it will be received or accredited as a chemical treatise.

The English department in any institution, large or small, cannot stand by itself; it needs, for the great work to be done, the coöperation of all the other departments. This is doubly true, I think, in a college like our own, which depends so largely for its clientele upon a people who are German by descent,

and who, to a surprising degree, still employ, in their daily, current speech, a dialect of the *Mutter Sprache*, strongly colored by English influence, known as the "Pennsylvania German." The habits and forms of English speech, inevitably resulting from this practice, I need not rehearse here. They are sufficiently well known to the readers I address. An appreciation of this fact makes the teaching of English at Franklin and Marshall a hopeless task without the constant and cheerful coöperation of the other departments.

Another fact which is often overlooked, but which ought, I think, to receive some attention, is the special disadvantage under which the teacher of English labors, as compared with the teacher of Greek, Latin or French. The student of these other tongues reads and hears only the pure or standard language, as employed by the masters in these several literatures; the student of English, on the other hand, hears so commonly, in his daily intercourse, a language that is careless, slipshod, often even illiterate and ungrammatical. It is the fate, therefore, of the English department (and, in this region, of the German as well) to be forever doing and forever undone—an Herculean, Sisyphean task—disheartening often to the last degree! It is but just, however, to say that our students of German descent and environment, conscious as they are of their shortcomings, and eager to eradicate them, are in general the hardest, most persevering, most painstaking workers; and, because they treat the English as a difficulty to be overcome, often exhibit, in the end, the best results.

As outlined in *The Annual Register*, the work of the English department at Franklin and Marshall is threefold; it has to do with language, literature, and rhetoric or composition. It aims at three clearly defined objects: (1) An intelligent understanding of the origin and development of the English language and literature; (2) A general acquaintance with English literature; (3) A reasonable proficiency in English composition.

The first of these objects, viz., the systematic study of the

language as revealed by representative specimens of the literature, is attempted in a series of four required courses occupying the entire Junior year, and in one elective course offered in the first semester of the Senior year.

In accordance with a plan which in many institutions has long since passed the experimental stage, language study, as demanding more mature powers of mind, is reserved for the later years of the course. Instead, too, of beginning with the most ancient and least familiar specimens, the process is reversed, and the movement is steadily backward, from the Modern or more familiar forms of the language, through the Middle or less familiar, to the Old English or Anglo-Saxon. By the old plan, the student was confronted at the outset by a language so strange as to be practically a foreign tongue, and to be mastered only as a dead language is mastered; by the new method, he never loses his hold upon the living tongue, but is enabled, with ease and certainty, to trace its several stages of development. For the earnest, alert student a course of this kind is worth more, so far as the intelligent understanding of historical English grammar is concerned, than all the text books upon the subject ever written.

The specimens chosen for this study are not mere texts for the illustration of philological evolution, but are in themselves, with one or two minor exceptions, masterpieces of the literature. The course begins with *The Faerie Queene* of Spenser, "The Poet's Poet," a typical representative of the glorious Elizabethan age. Going back two centuries to Chaucer, "The Father of Modern English Literature," *The Prologue to The Canterbury Tales* and part of *The Knight's Tale* are read. Then, by way of contrast in spirit, metre, form, and language, follows the didactic, alliterative *Vision of Piers the Plowman*, by William Langland, a stern contemporary of the gentle Chaucer. The Junior year is finished by the reading of two Middle English specimens: *The Ormulum*, a poem written by the monk Orm or Ormin for the guidance of his brothers of the order, and *The Ancren Riwele*

(Rule of the Anchoresses), a naïve treatise in prose for the edification of a society of holy nuns living in a convent at Tarente, in Dorsetshire.

Since the introduction of the elective system Old English has been made optional. Those who wish to trace the language back through pre-Conquest times to its earliest known sources are given the opportunity, in the first semester of the Senior year, to read a number of specimens of the simple, unmodified Anglo-Saxon, finding its primitive expression in such noble poems as *Deor's Lament*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *The Fight at Brunanburh*, or, earlier still, *Beowulf*, rightly called "Our Old English Epic." All scoffers to the contrary, there are treasures hoarded up in our very oldest literature, the literature produced in Britain before the coming of the Normans, which only the trained student of our mother tongue can unlock, but which ought to be the common property of the English-speaking race.

The second of the objects aimed at by the English department, viz., a general acquaintance with English literature, is considered in a series of six required courses covering the Sophomore and Senior years, and in one elective course offered during the Senior year.

In the first semester of the Sophomore year an historical sketch of English literature is presented, from the landing of Hengist and Horsa at Ebb's Fleet, in 445, to the year 1900. This demonstrates to the student the intimate relation between the history of the English people and the literature they have produced; he is given a bird's eye view of the whole field; he is furnished with the proper perspective and a sense of proportion. After this general survey comes a careful and critical reading in the class-room of a few representative essayists, such as Bacon, Addison, and Lamb. The Sophomore year is then closed with a special study of Burke, pronounced by more than one critic our greatest master of English prose. His speeches on *Taxation* and *Conciliation* are read and discussed in the class-room.

In the study of literature, the required work of the Senior year consists, during the first semester, of a course of lectures on the Elizabethan drama, with illustrative readings of selected plays of Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Webster. In the second semester lectures are continued on some period or some group of writers particularly noteworthy in the history of the literature. The readings are usually from Shakspeare's *As You Like It*, *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*, and Milton's *Comus* and *Lycidas*.

Throughout the year a one hour's course of Shakspeare study is open to those who elect it. This course consists of a critical reading, in the chronological order, of as many plays (comedies, histories, tragedies, romances) as time and circumstances may permit. The constant aim here is not only to familiarize the student with Shakspeare's dramatic work, but also to trace in the plays, as they were produced from year to year, the steady development of his mind and art. This is deemed by modern scholars the one true and fruitful method of Shakspeare study.

For the past two years, in response to a special request, I have conducted, for a limited number of Seniors, a class in literary criticism. The method has been that of an informal seminar, with readings in the English critics from Sir Philip Sidney to Walter Pater, a weekly essay by a member of the class, and a free discussion of points as they arise.

And it is just here, I think, that the electives come to the relief of the teacher of English at Franklin and Marshall. Required as he is to carry the entire body of students through the four years' course, giving each man two hours per week in the class-room, he welcomes, in the elective system of the Senior year, the opportunity to work, along certain congenial lines, with a smaller body of men, who have chosen of their own free will the particular branch for its own sake or because of a decided bent that has been revealed during the previous routine of study. Both teacher and pupil come to this kind of work with a freshness of interest, a mutual understand-

ing, and a sense of coöperation that is encouraging, stimulative, and helpful. Individual needs are met in a way that is not possible when the class is large and heterogeneous and the work of many is necessarily perfunctory.

In the required English work it is indeed a great problem to know how to distribute one's time and attention. The teacher is handicapped by unevenness of preparation, dissimilarity of natural aptitude and cultivable power, diversity in responsiveness and willingness to work. The criticism sometimes brought to bear by the abler students, that they are held back and discouraged by the slow rate of progress timed to the necessities of their plodding classmates, is, from their point of view, just. They are not more conscious of the deplorable fact than is their teacher; but what is he to do—keenly alive as he is to the dilemma? May he go forward at the pace possible to the elect few, leaving the rest to flounder along as best they can? Or is he bound, in all his work, to consider the needs of the greatest number, and to adapt his instruction, as nearly as may be, to their aptitudes, powers, and possible rate of progress? Theoretically, the question may seem easy enough of answer; but its practical solution is, I contend, extremely difficult. It is here again that the electives of the Senior year come to the perplexed instructor's rescue, and make possible, for a season at least, and in a few chosen lines of work, the application of the theories he would fain apply throughout the four years' course.

It may not be out of place, at this point, to raise the vexed question, How shall literature be taught? To it there are many answers; but of all I have ever read none appeals to me more strongly or expresses my own views more nearly than that of Professor Martin W. Sampson, who, in a paper on "English at the University of Indiana," says: "The aim, then, in teaching literature is, I think, to give the student a thorough understanding of what he reads, and the ability to read sympathetically and understandingly in the future.
* * * There are many methods, but these methods are of

two kinds only: the method of the professor who preaches the beauty of the poet's utterance, and the method of him who makes his student systematically approach the work as a work of art, find out the laws of its existence as such, the mode of its manifestation, the meaning it has, and the significance of that meaning—in brief, to have his students interpret the work of art and ascertain what makes it just that and not something else. Literature, as every reader profoundly feels, is an appeal to all sides of our nature; but I venture to insist that as a *study*—and that is the point at issue—it must be approached intellectually. And here the purpose of literature, and the purpose of studying literature, must be sharply discriminated. The question is not, Apprehending literature, how shall I let it influence me? The question most definitely is, How shall I learn to apprehend literature, that thereby it may influence me?

“As far as class study is concerned, the instructor must draw the line once for all between the liking for reading and the understanding of literature. To all who assert that the study of literature must take into account the emotions, that it must remember questions of taste, I can only answer impatiently, Yes, I agree; but between taking them into account, and making them the prime object of the study, there is the difference between day and night. It is only by recognizing this difference that we professors of English cease to make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of those who see into the heart of things, that we can at all successfully disprove Freeman's* remark—caustic and four fifths true—‘English literature is only chatter about Shelley.’ As a friend of mine puts it: To understand literature is a matter of study, and may be taught in the class-room; to love literature is a matter of character, and can never be taught in a class-room. The professor who tries chiefly to make his students love literature wastes his energy for the sake of a few students who would love poetry

* The late E. A. Freeman, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, author of *The Norman Conquest*, etc.

anyway, and sacrifices the majority of his class, who are not yet ripe enough to love it. The professor who tries chiefly to make his students understand literature will give them something to incorporate into their character. For it is the peculiar grace of literature that whoso understands it loves it. It becomes to him a permanent possession, not a passing thrill."

To this I shall add only a word of my own. In the study of literature, as in every other serious study, the cardinal principle, as I conceive it, is to be thorough, to master whatever is attempted, be it little or much, and thereby acquire the power to interpret intelligently whatever may be taken up afterward. In the undergraduate body of a small college like ours those possessed of marked aptitude for the beauties of literature are, after all, few. The teacher, then, must see to it that all intellectually apprehend the subject-matter under consideration. If that be gained, the rest may follow.

A reasonable proficiency in English composition—the third of the objects aimed at by the department—is kept in view throughout the course.

The entire Freshman year is given up to a systematic drill in the principles of rhetoric, with frequent exercises and classroom criticism. In this connection I am glad to note that the Board of Trustees, by its action in June, 1902, associated the Freshman rhetoric with the course in elocution and oratory, effecting thereby a natural and proper grouping. By this arrangement Professor Adams has had charge of Freshman English during the present academic year, and has required a large amount of written work, with very thorough practice in the elements of rhetoric. In the Sophomore year further exercises of a varied character are required; during the Junior and Senior years the essays are more definite and exhaustive, having to do with assigned topics suggested by the particular work in hand. During the second semester of the Senior year a two hours' course (elective) is offered in the study of higher rhetoric and the theory of English prose style. It is based

on Lewes' *Principles of Success in Literature*, and is followed, as time permits, by the reading of certain illustrative specimens.

In closing I want to pay my mite of tribute to the college library and the two literary societies. The name of General J. Watts de Peyster stands out as that of our greatest single benefactor during the past twenty-five years—a name to be cherished with profoundest gratitude by every one whose work and interests connect him with these institutions. In the substantial and beautiful building erected and furnished by him, and to which he has contributed of volumes a vast number and of art treasures not a few, we have a good, practical, working library, where, under the skillful direction of Doctor Kieffer, our students of to-day enjoy advantages unknown to the undergraduate body of a decade ago. Concerning the present value and the future possibilities of the library, as the centre of our literary life and activity, I need say nothing. The facts are sufficiently patent to all.

And now, a last word about the literary societies—twin daughters of old Marshall College. Being by affiliation neither a Goethean nor a Diagnothian, I may, without prejudice or partiality, speak for both organizations. Their value as intellectual and social factors in our academic life cannot be overestimated; their efficiency as adjuncts to the several literary departments of the college I most fully recognize and most heartily appreciate. They keep alive the ancient traditions of Marshall College days at Mercersburg—traditions we all love and are proud to perpetuate. Where is the son of old Marshall or of Franklin and Marshall—be he a successful lawyer, preacher, or public man in any calling—who is not glad to acknowledge the debt of gratitude he owes to one or the other of these societies? To have been a worthy member of either may be counted an honor; not to have enjoyed that privilege, a misfortune. And if there be, among our older alumni, here and there, a sceptic, disposed to question

the life and efficiency of the literary societies in these later days, I would refer him to our record in intercollegiate debate since these contests were inaugurated in 1897. Of five bouts with sister colleges we have won four and lost but one! Truly the literary societies are not decadent; they are active, potent factors in the young twentieth century life of our Greater Franklin and Marshall.

VII.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

BY PROF. A. V. HIESTER, A.M.

The importance of political economy as part of a liberal education has been recognized from the beginning at Franklin and Marshall College, in theory, at least, if not always in practice. But the political economy of 1903 is not the political economy of 1853. Probably in no branch of the modern scholastic curriculum have the past fifty years witnessed greater changes than in the so-called "dismal science." These changes are of two kinds and may be designated as qualitative and quantitative. On the one hand, a new interest in the problems of industrial life, and a new consciousness of the value of political economy to the intelligent and conscientious citizen, have arisen; and, on the other, the character and aims of political economy, its methods and results, have been completely transformed.

Let us examine, first, the qualitative change. The political economy which was taught fifty years ago, not only in Franklin and Marshall College, but in every American college in which the subject was taught at all, was the abstract, dogmatic, individualistic, political economy of Adam Smith and his followers, who are collectively known to-day as the classical or orthodox school. This school was then in the flood tide of its success and influence. Its earlier opponents had been vanquished; its later rivals had not yet appeared to dispute its supremacy. Its great head was Adam Smith who published his epoch-making work, "The Wealth of Nations," in 1776. Smith outlined the chief doctrines of the classical school, but it was David Ricardo who developed and systematized them. Other important names in the history of the classical school are those of Malthus, Senior, Torrens, Chal-

mers, James Mill, Bentham, M'Culloch and Fawcett in England; Rau, Nebenius, von Thünen and Hermann in Germany; Say, Dunoyer, Rossi, Cherbuliez and Bastiat in France; Scialoja and Ferrara in Italy; Amasa Walker, Perry, Bascom, Bowen and Sumner in the United States.

The distinguishing feature of this school is their extreme use, or rather, their abuse, of deduction as a method of investigation, and the consequent abstract and absolute character of their conclusions. The characteristic strength and weakness of this method are best seen in Ricardo, for while Smith used the deductive method chiefly his practical sense and passion for reality saved him from the most glaring faults and errors of later writers. Ricardo moved in a world of abstractions. His method was to start from arbitrary assumptions, reason deductively from them, and announce his conclusions as absolute immutable laws from which there could be no deviation. Now the validity of conclusions reached by such a process of logic requires, first, that the reasoning be correct, and, secondly, that the deduction set out, not from *a priori* assumptions, but from proved generalizations. Ricardo himself was a master of abstract reasoning, which unfortunately many of his followers were not. But his assumptions were frequently unreal or at least one-sided. The consequence was that his conclusions could not always be verified from experience. Despite the evident defects of his method Ricardo exercised a powerful influence on later writers. The prospect of embracing all humanity in the mighty sweep of a logical process, which should have all the certainty and comprehensiveness of a mathematical demonstration, was peculiarly attractive to a certain type of mind; and under the influence of Ricardo's example political economy more and more turned its back on observation and sought to evolve the laws of industrial phenomena out of a few hasty generalizations by a play of logic. Instead of dealing with man as he actually is as its subject of investigation it set up an "economic man," an imaginary being who was conceived to be endowed with but

two desires, that of acquiring wealth and that of avoiding exertion. Political economy thus became an abstract science whose conclusions were for the most part in the air, far above the level of concrete reality, and did not correspond with fact.

The assumptions from which the deductive process of the classical school sets out are taken from the facts of psychical existence and of the physical and social environment. But whatever their source they are universally and eternally true. All disturbing causes and personal peculiarities are completely ignored. The most important of these assumptions are the following:

1. *Law of Diminishing Returns.*—After a certain point has been reached in the productive process every additional increment of labor and capital will yield proportionately smaller returns.

2. *Law of Demand.*—The utility afforded by any increment of any desired object diminishes with increase of the amount possessed.

3. *Law of Supply.*—Every one tries to secure material well-being with the least possible sacrifice.

4. *Law of Freedom.*—Within certain legal limits the individual is free to act according to his own will.

What is the degree of validity of these assumptions? Are they applicable to all times and places, or do they express tendencies only which are liable to be counteracted by disturbing forces, or do they apply only to certain forms of industrial organization, or are they merely fictions of the imagination applicable to no forms of society that have ever existed or ever will exist? Upon this question of validity hangs the whole question of the legitimacy and adequacy of the deductive method in political economy.

That pure deduction is of itself inadequate may be seen from a closer examination of any one of the foregoing assumptions. The third will serve as an illustration. It is not true that the real man as we know him seeks under all conditions and circumstances the greatest material good with the least

sacrifice. All that the law of supply can be made to mean is that, all other things being equal, a greater surplus of material well-being over sacrifice will be preferred to a smaller one. But other things are not equal in human society as we actually know it. In the first place, men may differ widely in their quantitative comparison of different kinds of sacrifice with each other and with the prospect of additional wealth. Such differences must be ascertained from observation and induction before the law can be applied. In the second place, there is also a qualitative comparison. The idea of sacrifice broadly includes all the varied motives, higher and lower, altruistic as well as egoistic, which conflict with the desire of pecuniary gain. The unconscious influence of habit, the conscious regard for custom or class prejudice, the love of independence, regard for health, philanthropy, patriotism, are all economic motors which differ widely in different persons and act together in combinations of endless variety. Here again observation and induction are required to determine the precise degree in which the various economic factors act under given conditions. It is clear, therefore, that neither the desire for wealth nor the aversion to labor can be treated as a uniform force equally operative in all human beings at all times.

The failure of the classical school to explain all economic phenomena from a few simple principles prepared the way for the so-called historical school, the aim of which is to reconstruct political economy by the aid of history and sociology. Its fundamental position lies in its recognition of the principle of development in economic life and its consequent emphasis of the dynamical, as distinguished from the statical, elements in industrial organization. This is the organic conception of society made possible by the growth of biology. Society is no longer regarded as a mechanical compound of independent elements, but as an organic unity composed of parts vitally related to one another and undergoing a continuous process of development; and the methods of the phys-

ical and mathematical sciences are, therefore, no longer adequate.

The historical school originated in Germany about the middle of the century, although its leading conception had been anticipated much earlier. As early as 1831 Richard Jones, an English writer, rejected some of the conclusions of the classical school on the ground that they were true only within very narrow limits. He also urged the need of historical investigation. A few years later Friedrich List protested against the cosmopolitanism of the classical school and introduced into German thought the idea of historical development as applied to economic phenomena. The French philosopher, Auguste Comte, was another forerunner of the historical school. Economic phenomena, he said, in his "*Philosophie Positive*," published in 1839, were so entwined with other social facts that a separate science of them was impossible. The all-inclusive science of society, to which he gave the name sociology, he divided into social statics, dealing with facts of co-existence, and social dynamics, having to do with facts of sequence. For the former he urged the method of direct observation as the most appropriate; for the latter, comparison.

While Comte clearly foreshadowed the method and leading doctrines of the historical school he had no influence on German economic thought, for his writings were not known in Germany fifty years ago. Not only had the historical school an independent German origin, but its founders, instead of approaching political economy from the side of general philosophy, as Comte had done, found their distinctive views in the conceptions of the historical school of jurisprudence of which Savigny was the most eminent representative. The fundamental conception of this school was that the juristic system is not a fixed social phenomenon, but stands in vital relation with the other co-existent social factors and is variable from one stage in the progress of society to another. It is a product of evolution and what is appropriate to one

stage of social progress may be altogether inapplicable to another. The extension of these ideas to the economic field made possible the relative point of view in political economy. The essential relativity of economic systems was recognized and the cosmopolitanism and perpetualism of the classical school—the one, the assumption of a system equally true in every country, the other, the assumption of a system applicable to every social stage—were alike discredited.

The mediator of these new ideas and the literary creator of the historical school was Wilhelm Roscher, who was soon joined, however, by two other writers, Bruno Hildebrand and Karl Knies. These three must be regarded as the joint founders of the school. Roscher's views are stated in his "*Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Staatswirthschaft nach Geschichtlicher Methode*," published in 1843. In the preface to that work he insists that the economic institutions of all the peoples of whom we can learn anything must be studied and compared; that few of them have been salutary or detrimental to all peoples and at all stages of culture, and that it is a principal task of science to show how and why out of what was once reasonable and beneficent the unwise and inexpedient has often gradually arisen.

Hildebrand's chief contribution is an unfinished work, entitled "*Die Nationalökonomie der Gegenwart und Zukunft*," the first volume of which was published in 1848. His declared object is to open a way in the economic field to a thorough historical direction and method and to transform the science of political economy into a doctrine of the laws of the economic development of nations.

The most systematic and complete exposition, however, of the historical school is the work of Knies, entitled "*Die Politische Oekonomie vom Standpunkte der Geschichtlichen Methode*," published in 1853. Its thesis is that the economic organization of society at a given period, and the contemporary economic doctrines, are the products of a definite historical development; that both are in vital connection with

the whole social organism of the period; and that neither can be regarded as absolutely good and right, but only as a stage in a continuous historical evolution.

While the cardinal point of difference between the classical and historical schools is the insistence by the latter on the relativity of economic phenomena and theories, and the importance of the study of economic history, including the empirical and statistical observation of the present, other differences are not lacking. The historical method naturally leads up to a consideration of ends, for a process of development implies a development towards something. The greater recognition of ethical and social ideals in economic discussion in recent years is, therefore, largely, if not wholly, traceable to the historical school. The oldest view of political economy as an art regarded it mainly as a part of the art of public finance. Its avowed purpose was to make the individual rich in order that the government might not lack revenue. By the time of Adam Smith the relation between these two ends had been reversed and the former had come to be regarded as independent of, and prior to, the second. Since Adam Smith the great practical end of the science has been the investigation of the natural process of social production and distribution. At first, production was regarded as the more important and its improvement was the main business of economists. But about the first quarter of the nineteenth century another reversal took place, and distribution became the chief practical concern of political economy. During the past half century the problems of distribution have become increasingly important, so that the professed end of economic investigation is to-day less an increased production of wealth than the amelioration of social conditions through just principles of distribution. This growing importance of distribution as a practical problem has opened wide the door to ethical considerations. It is an ethical postulate that the distribution of wealth should aim at realizing social justice. But what is social justice? Whether this inquiry be answered from the

viewpoint of individualism or of socialism the result is the same—the interjection of ethical considerations into economic discussions. This change may be traced in the definitions of political economy from Adam Smith and Say, both of whom make the production of wealth, and Ricardo, who makes the theory of value, the chief subject of inquiry, to Roscher, the founder of the historical school, who begins his survey of the science with the declaration: “Ausgangspunkt wie Zielpunkt unserer Wissenschaft ist der Mensch.”

A further distinction between the two schools is the more favorable attitude of the historical school to the principle of state action. The view of the classical school is that the sole office of the state is the protection of its members from fraud and violence. This is the *laissez-faire* principle of the Physiocrats which attributes all economic phenomena to the operation of uncontrolled natural laws and natural instincts; and holds that state interference with industry and trade can never be beneficial, and that all economic evils if left alone will cure themselves. While this doctrine performed in its day a service of undoubted value in discrediting the old mercantile system of artificial restrictions by the state it has itself gone down before the critical spirit and growing practical demands of modern civilization. The position of the historical school is that the state is not merely an institution of police but also an organ of the nation for all ends which cannot be accomplished well by individual effort; each case, however, to be determined on its own merits. The limits, within which the state may act to promote production and other industrial activities, and regulate the evils of unrestricted competition, on the one hand, and those of unrestrained monopoly, on the other, have been with the historical school a fruitful subject of investigation; and the conclusions which have been reached may be seen to-day in all civilized countries in their sanitary legislation, their factory and mining acts, their free systems of education, and in their municipal and state enterprises of every sort. Probably no single

tenet of the "old" political economy has been so thoroughly discredited as this principle of *laissez-faire*.

A final distinction to be noticed here is the contention of the historical school that political economy needs above all to be fused into a complete science of society. This, it has been seen, was the view of Comte; and the best economists of Germany at the present time are strongly advocating it. The intimate connection between economic phenomena, on the one side, and laws, political institutions, the family life, social customs and judgments, religion, education, art, science, speech, etc., on the other, is being recognized to-day as never before. More and more clearly has it come to be seen, for example, that the personal and moral qualities of the laborer, his comfort and happiness, his aspirations, his social surroundings and physical well-being, are important factors in the production of wealth and dare not be ignored. Most of the errors of the older economists were due to the neglect of just such factors. Instead of conceiving man as he actually is, a being subject to many complex forces, they set up an abstract economic man and endowed him with a few simple motives. The economic system of a nation being only a particular subject of its whole economy, all the parts of which are indissolubly connected, it is clear that economic phenomena cannot be treated apart from other phases of social life and progress, and that political economy is a branch of sociology, not an independent science.

The movement started fifty years ago by Roscher at Leipzig, Hildebrand at Jena, and Knies at Heidelberg, quickly took possession of the German universities and has long since spread to every civilized country. Its best known representatives at the present time are Knies, Schmoller, Nasse, Held, Brentano, von Scheel, Schäffle, Schönberg and Wagner in Germany; De Laveleye in Belgium; Ingram, Marshall, Rogers, Foxwell, Cunningham and Symes in England; Ely, Jenks, James, H. C. Adams, W. J. Ashley and Bemis in the United States. Outside Germany its influence has been

greatest in Italy and the United States and least in France. In England and France the classical school is still dominant, but it is no longer the classical school of fifty and a hundred years ago. It has felt the quickening influence of the historical school, and the old methods and doctrines have been modified in varying degrees. On the other hand, the historical school has also exhibited divergent tendencies. From the extreme position of Knies, Schmoller and Brentano in Germany, and Ingram and Cliffe-Leslie in England, all of whom either reject altogether the use of the deductive method or hold that the part it has to play is unimportant and soon exhausted, there has been a general reactionary movement toward a rational use of deduction. While some of the historical school still use deduction more or less sparingly others employ it quite freely. During the past quarter of a century a number of economists in Austria have returned to a more general use of deduction, although their results differ very materially from those of the old classical school. Their agreement in method and leading doctrines is so striking that they are now regarded as a distinct school. The most prominent members of this Austrian school are Menger, von Wieser, Sax and Böhm-Bawerk. These men have strongly influenced writers who are not of this school; as Block in France, Cossa in Italy, Clark and Patten in the United States.

At the present time the line of division between the classical and historical schools is growing dim and ragged. The neutral ground between them is rapidly filling up. In fact, most modern economists decline to be considered of any school. This is particularly true of American writers. The conviction is growing that for the best results both induction and deduction are needed, and that the value of either is increased when supplemented by a valid use of the other. While deduction is required to control and guide inductive observation, induction is necessary to establish the premises of deduction and check, test, confirm and apply its results.

That Franklin and Marshall has kept step with the march of progress in economic science the past fifty years, may easily be seen from an examination of the list of writers whose treatises have been used in the class-room from time to time. For the first five years the instruction in political economy was based either directly, or through lectures, on Say's "Political Economy." Then for about fifteen years Wayland's "Elements of Political Economy" was used. After Carey's "Manual of Social Science" had been used three or four years Perry's "Political Economy" was adopted. With the exception of two or three intercalations of Newcomb's and Sumner's treatises Perry was used from 1875 to 1889. From 1890 to 1899 F. A. Walker's "Political Economy" was in continuous use and since 1900 Bullock's "Introduction to the Study of Economics" has been used. Of these writers both Say and Wayland are best known as popularizers of Adam Smith. The former was a Frenchman and among the very first of the continental writers to recognize the value of Smith's work. He had the French art of easy and lucid exposition and his work obtained a wide circulation, both in translations and in its original form. Say did more than all other continental writers combined to recommend Smith to European and American thought. Wayland was a well-known American writer on moral and economic science. Carey occupies a unique position in the history of political economy. Although he rejected many of its conclusions he must be classed with the classical school. He was an indefatigable student of economic phenomena, but his writings have had little influence either in America or abroad. He and his immediate followers are frequently known as the American school. Perry and Sumner represent the classical school in its most extreme form, for they go beyond their English and French masters in claiming for all economic laws the force of immutable laws of nature. The following quotation from Sumner will show where they stand: "We are living under immutable and inexorable laws of social organiza-

tion which we can neither avoid nor evade and which avenge themselves when we try to escape their operation." Newcomb also belongs to the classical school, but his views are much more moderate than those of Perry and Sumner, particularly on the question of state interference in trade and industry. "The school of non-interference," he says, "claims that as a general rule these [economic] ends are best attained by giving the adult individual the widest liberty within the limits prescribed by considerations of health and morality." Walker was one of the ablest economists America has produced. He is usually classed with the moderate wing of the historical school, but he might more appropriately be defined as an eclectic. He represents perhaps better than any other the best tendencies of American political economy at the present time. This is particularly true of his position on the question of state interference. He holds that while the necessity of making exceptions to the rule of freedom of individual action can no longer be questioned, the presumption is in favor of liberty, and that the burden of proof lies in every case on those who advocate the interference of the state in the domain of industry and trade. Within the past few years there has been a reaction from the views entertained by many of the younger American economists who received their training in the German universities and who were for a time carried away by the views of the extreme historical school; and Walker's position has in consequence found increasing acceptance. Bullock is an excellent representative of the moderate historical school as it has developed in the United States.

The second great change in the study of political economy at Franklin and Marshall during the past fifty years is a quantitative one. Prior to 1860 the science of political economy was unknown to the great mass of the American people. It had no place save in the scholastic curriculum, and even there it was confined within the narrowest possible limits, so that it had little value either as a mental discipline

or as a practical study, and not only excited little interest on the part of the student, but resulted in a superficiality even worse than ignorance. The marked interest in economic problems which has been excited during the past quarter of a century, not only in our colleges and universities, but among intelligent and thoughtful men generally, is largely due to the Civil War. That great conflict thrust upon the American people new problems. Without warning our public men were confronted with the most delicate and momentous questions of international and constitutional law, of taxation, finance and administration. Many of these questions were of a legal or political character, and our statesmen, who were recruited for the most part from the ranks of the legal profession, were not wholly unprepared to grapple with them and undertake their solution. Of course there were differences of opinion, the result of attempts to apply different political theories. But such differences only go to prove that our public men were familiar with the principles involved in the settlement of such questions, and that their discussion had received sufficient attention to permit the crystallization of opinions and judgments into political dogmas.

But in the solution of the purely economic problems arising out of the war we were far less fortunate than when dealing with those of a legal and political character. The gigantic proportions of our military operations demanded the utilization of every possible source of revenue. The old familiar methods and policies were confessedly inadequate and new ones had to be formulated and inaugurated without delay. How poorly our public men were equipped to meet the grave problems of taxation, finance and currency, thus suddenly thrust upon them, every student of American economic history knows. In nothing had their training been so greatly neglected as in political economy and finance. These had never been studied seriously in the schools, nor anywhere else for that matter, and when our statesmen began to deal with conditions and phenomena, of whose underlying principles they

had little conception, they piled blunder on blunder. It is true they had the quick adaptability of the American genius, and of energy, patriotism and the spirit of self-sacrifice there was no lack; but these could not take the place of training and experience. Thus through the unwise policy of the Treasury department the country was driven into a suspension of specie payments at the very beginning of the war, and it was only seventeen years later that resumption became an accomplished fact. Without consideration of alternatives the country was flooded with an irredeemable paper currency which inaugurated an era of speculation, swelled the national debt at least one billion dollars, debauched the public conscience, and has not yet ceased to be a source of anxiety and danger. With the design of securing revenue for the war, not from any purpose of establishing a fixed policy, heavy duties were laid on all imports. Under the protection of these duties great business interests came into existence which are yet largely dependent on a continuance of the extreme temporary measures of the war period.

Out of these blunders, which, while less disastrous than they would have been in a country with more limited resources than ours, were recognized nevertheless as blunders, and out of the consciousness of ignorance of the people when called to pass upon the economic questions created by the war, a desire to know something of the principles underlying the material well-being of the nation began to arise among all classes and in every walk of life. The colleges and universities did not long remain untouched by this demand, but proceeded to meet it by establishing, in place of the old rigid curriculum made up almost wholly of Latin, Greek, Mathematics and Philosophy, more flexible courses of study which afforded larger opportunities for instruction in the political and social sciences. The magnitude of this change may be gathered from the fact that in the fourteen years from 1870 to 1884 the number of hours of instruction in political economy increased ninefold in the undergraduate departments of

Yale University; eightfold at Columbia; sixfold at the University of Michigan; sixfold at Harvard; and sevenfold at Cornell.

At Franklin and Marshall this quantitative change has not been so great as at the larger institutions, and it took place somewhat later. From 1853 to 1888 one-third of the senior year, two hours a week, was given to political economy; from 1889 to 1893, two-thirds; and from 1894 to 1901 the whole of the senior year. In 1900 it was transferred to the junior year in order to make room for general and applied sociology, political science and constitutional law in the senior year. Since 1888 the increase in the number of hours of instruction has been threefold. But if all the social and political sciences be taken as the basis of comparison the increase will be seen to be much greater. Instruction is now given in three or four branches of study that were not in the curriculum as late as five years ago. If these be taken into consideration, the increase since 1888 has been nearly tenfold, and since 1894, over threefold.

Marked as have been both the qualitative and quantitative changes in political economy at Franklin and Marshall, during the first half century of her existence, it is very probable that he who fifty years hence shall review the growth and progress of that science during the next half century will be able to record still greater changes. Whatever changes of character there may be, it is certain that the practical importance of economic studies in schemes of education will be increasingly recognized. The whole trend of civilization is in this direction. In the past centuries civilized governments have been chiefly concerned with questions of life and property. Under the influence of Christian ideals the security of life and liberty has now been fairly attained and the great questions of the present are, and those of the future will be, questions of industry and trade, wealth and property. That the great body of public questions now confronting the American people are economic questions, will be readily con-

ceded by the most casual reader of our periodical literature. Tariffs, reciprocity, money, banking, the Isthmian canal, merchant shipping, commercial crises, strikes and lockouts, taxation, measured increments and land nationalization, municipal ownership of natural monopolies, etc., are all questions of political economy. For the intelligent voter the need of economic instruction is imperative; and a grave responsibility rests, therefore, on our schools and colleges. Furthermore, not only is social life daily growing more complex but we are rapidly approaching in this country a point where we must adapt ourselves to new conditions. We are fast losing the attributes of a young country. We no longer have extensive tracts of unoccupied fertile lands and a scanty population. Wages and profits are gradually approaching foreign levels. When our population has become dense and our land is all occupied and our great resources have begun to diminish we may no longer blunder with impunity. Trained men will be needed to solve the economic problems of the future; and the time is coming when a legal training, or military service, or success as a ward boss or political manipulator, will cease to be considered an all-sufficient title to a seat in legislative halls.

Lest it might be thought that the practical value of political economy is its only claim to recognition in a scholastic curriculum, it ought to be said yet that it has value also as a mental discipline. In the first place, it cultivates the imagination much as geometry does. It is not possible in the economic sphere to isolate a principle as in physics or chemistry; and it is only through an exercise of the imagination that a general principle can be seen in the concrete phenomena. What Tyndall has written of the importance of the imagination in physical science is even more true of political economy. "There are Tories even in science," he says, "who regard imagination as a faculty to be feared and avoided rather than employed. They had observed its action in weak vessels and were unduly impressed by its disasters.

But they might with equal justice point to exploded boilers as an argument against the use of steam. Bounded and conditioned by coöperant reason imagination becomes the mightiest instrument of the physical discoverer. Newton's passage from a falling apple to a falling moon was at the outset a leap of the imagination." Finally, political economy also cultivates the power of close reasoning, exactness and clearness in speaking and writing, and, above all, a true regard for facts and for the immediate interests of life.

VIII.

THE LITERARY SOCIETIES—WHAT THE STUDENTS HAVE DONE FOR THEM AND WHAT THEY HAVE DONE FOR THE STUDENTS.

BY SAMUEL H. RANCK.

In a recent volume, "Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution," Prince Kropotkin shows that the process of evolution, in animals and in man, is more than the survival of the fittest through the struggle for existence. The strength and the cunning of the individual, when used only for selfish ends, in the long run, defeat their purpose; and to prove his thesis Kropotkin cites a host of instances among animals, and among savage, barbarous and civilized people. Mutual aid is the factor that makes the ant and the bee the marvels that they are. Mutual aid is the factor that makes life endurable for man, even though hosts of persons profess a philosophy of mutual antagonism, of self aggrandizement, which few, however, have the heart to carry out to its full extent.

During the middle ages, when universities took their rise in Europe, the factor of mutual aid, organized and unorganized, was a most important one in the life of the students; and such it has remained to this day, and must always remain. The association of men with each other at college, when rightly understood, is one of mutual aid, and at the same time is one of the most important parts of their education. Teachers, buildings, libraries, laboratories, and endowments have their place, and these have been regarded with various degrees of importance at different periods of the centuries of university and college life; but through it all there have been the student organizations for mutual aid—sometimes for self protection or political purposes, as were the "nations" of the mediæval universities, sometimes for social purposes, sometimes

for the intellectual advancement of the members, and often for the combination of these in more or less unequal proportions. And the college literary society as we know it in America, or as it has been known in the past in some of our colleges (for in many colleges the old type of literary society no longer exists), is one of the organized forms of mutual aid among students.

The college literary society in America is a product of the latter part of the eighteenth century and is an outgrowth of the debating society, which flourished, under Anglo-Saxon political institutions, in England and America. The Crotonian Society of Yale was perhaps the earliest of these debating societies in America, and it made way for the Linonian, the oldest of the permanent literary societies, founded in 1753, when Yale was little more than half a century old. The Brothers in Unity, the rival of the Linonian, was founded in 1768. Both have been dead for more than a generation, though for three quarters of a century they were a most important feature of the undergraduate life at New Haven. Speaking and debating clubs were organized at Harvard a few years after the Linonian Society of Yale: the Calabogus Club about 1758, the Whitefield Club in 1759, the Harvard Institute in 1770. The Plain-Dealing and Well-Meaning Clubs of Princeton were organized soon after the foundation of the college in 1746, but they were suppressed by the faculty on account of unseemly rivalry in 1764. A year later the Cliosophic Society of Princeton was founded and in 1769 the American Whig; and these two are the best known college literary societies that have come down to us from the eighteenth century. They have had a most important part in the training of Princeton men. In times past the rivalry between them was bitter and intense, during the visit of Lafayette to Princeton in 1824 almost culminating in a riot, the circumstances of which the late Professor William M. Nevins told in his most charming way in the *College Student* of January, 1885. This spirit of intense rivalry was a regular thing be-

tween the two literary societies of each college in former generations, the Goethean Literary Society at one period of its history threatening to secede from Marshall College because the faculty and Board of Trustees interfered with the plans for gaining an advantage over the Diagnothians.

The literary societies of Dickinson College, the Belles Lettres and the Union Philosophical, were established soon after the founding of the college in 1783, the former dating from 1786 and the latter from 1789. The literary societies of Amherst, the Alexandrian and the Athenian, were organized the year of the founding of the college (1821), and for many years they flourished, though both are now extinct.

The literary societies at Franklin and Marshall College, the Diagnothian and the Goethean, are older than the college, older than Marshall College, and through the literary societies of Jefferson College their lineage may be traced to Princeton. Jefferson College, at Canonsburg, Pa., had two literary societies, the Philo and the Franklin, which were founded at the old Jefferson Academy, the former on August 23, 1797, and the latter on November 14 of the same year. These societies borrowed their constitutions to a large extent from the Clio-sophic and Whig Societies of Princeton.

In 1834 Samuel Reed Fisher graduated from Jefferson College and the same year entered the Theological Seminary connected with the High School of the Reformed Church at York, Pa. Here, in the following year, he was instrumental in founding the literary societies now at Franklin and Marshall. He wrote their constitutions, and the Goethean Society, at least, is still full of points similar to the constitution of the old Franklin Society at Jefferson, an indication that Mr. Fisher had probably been a member of the Franklin. The methods of the societies founded at York and the plan of their organization—the importance placed on the development of their libraries and their museums—indicate that they were also strongly influenced by the American Lyceum and the work of Josiah Holbrook, which was then attracting so much attention in the country.

A general meeting of the students of the High School at York was held in one of the recitation rooms in June, 1835, when it was unanimously agreed that the whole number of students should be equally divided by lot into two distinct literary societies. Mr. Fisher's lot fell with the organization which was named in honor of the great German poet who had so recently died. Both societies were organized June 8, 1835. On the moving of the High School to Mercersburg in the fall of 1835, of the eighteen students who followed the two professors to the new seat of learning, seven* were Diagnothians and eleven were Goetheans.

With the large additions of new students at Mercersburg the societies at once became most flourishing. Before the end of the first year a literary contest was held between them that excited the greatest interest throughout the whole community, so much so that only one more was held, the following year—the faculty deeming it prudent to discontinue them on account of the intense feeling they aroused. A feature inaugurated by the societies soon after their removal to Mercersburg survives, in a modified form, to this day—the address during commencement week by some distinguished citizen now known as the Biennial Oration. In the early days these addresses were published by the societies in pamphlet form, a practice that has long been discontinued, to the regret of many.

The great event, however, in the life of the societies at Mercersburg was the building of the society halls. From their beginning they had put great stress on their libraries, and embraced every opportunity to increase them. The libraries grew, and, as libraries are in the habit of doing, constantly demanded more space. The society meetings were first held in the prayer hall of the Seminary building at Mercersburg, both societies using the same hall—a source of trouble which finally led to the suggestion by Dr. John Williamson Nevin that they should build halls for themselves. The societies at

* This number is given as six in one of the histories of the Diagnothian Society.

Princeton had their halls; why not those of Marshall College? The proposal was received with enthusiasm by the students, some of whom spent whole vacations in canvassing the country for the necessary funds. (See Appel, *Recollections of College Life*.)

Exactly the same size and alike as two peas in their exteriors, a requirement imposed upon them by the authorities, the halls were located a certain distance apart, with the space between them reserved for the future college building, of which they were to be regarded as wings. The corner-stone of the new Goethean Hall was laid with appropriate ceremonies on Goethe's birthday, August 28, 1844,* and that of the Diagnothian Hall on July 4, 1845; and after many difficulties and trials the halls were completed and dedicated, the Diagnothian July 2, 1847, the Goethean July 4—two days later. The mere fact of the building of these halls in an institution young and poor, with comparatively few students and not more than fifty graduates, is sufficient proof of the importance with which they were regarded, the affection and loyalty they aroused, and of the part they played in the life of the college. The total cost of these two halls was about \$12,000.

To the men who helped to build the halls the societies gave a training of the greatest value; and it was not only the regret at leaving the old college, but the loss of their society halls, that caused many an old Marshall student to shed tears on the moving of the college to Lancaster. And this feeling, this love for old Mercersburg, many of the men carried with them to their graves, never becoming reconciled to the institution, our Alma Mater, in Lancaster—Franklin and Marshall College. The feeling came to the surface at the first meeting of the Alumni Association in Lancaster in 1853, and I noticed it still more strongly only a few years ago in correspondence with the family of one of the old Marshall boys who had died in Ohio.

* In some of the records the date of the laying of the corner stone of the Goethean Hall is given as July 4, 1845.

The literary societies came to Lancaster on the founding of Franklin and Marshall College in 1853, and though comparatively few of the old students came with them the old spirit that animated the boys who built the society halls at Mercersburg was as active as ever. The loss of their halls on leaving Mercersburg was a great blow to them, even though they were partly indemnified by the Trustees of the College. They felt, however, that they must have their own halls, wings of the college building and exactly alike externally, at Franklin and Marshall. And so the students set about to build themselves the halls the students at Lancaster now know so well. It was an undertaking on their part that spoke volumes for the regard they had for their literary societies.

The corner-stones of both the halls were laid July 20, 1856, amid great rejoicing, and both were dedicated July 28, 1857. But troubles were still in store for them. The panic of 1857 was upon the country; subscriptions could not be collected; the builders could not be paid; and finally the halls were seized by the sheriff. In this dire calamity the students set to work with renewed energy, going from house to house on the streets of Lancaster asking for money to take their halls out of the hands of the sheriff. And they succeeded. Those boys did telling work for their societies, but in doing it their societies did even more for them.

After the society halls were built at Franklin and Marshall the societies went on in their usual course with little change, except that the interest in them on the part of the undergraduate body has gradually decreased, with now and then a movement in the other direction, due to the efforts of a comparatively few men who have worked together in one or the other of the societies. With the decline of interest there has disappeared the intense rivalry that was formerly manifested in so many ways, and especially in the canvass for new members.

The most important undertaking of the societies since the erection of their halls was the establishment of the *College Student*, the first number of which was published in January,

1881. The societies together control this publication, and the contents of its twenty-three volumes are some indication of the condition of the societies during the last twenty-three years.

With their handsomely frescoed halls, their libraries, their museums, and the furniture and fittings, each society is the owner of property worth about \$20,000. The two libraries alone contain over 16,000 well-selected books. Excepting the literary societies of Princeton alone, I believe they are the most valuable college literary society properties in the world. To accomplish all this men have denied themselves many things, on the one hand to give money, and on the other, to give hundreds of hours of precious time to forward their society's interests. It is the men who have done these things for whom the societies have done most. The societies have benefited the men only as the men have worked for them. The man who will not work gets nothing out of them. He only hinders his fellows.

In their inception the literary societies supplied the training in a number of directions that is now supplied by the college; for in those days there were no professors of oratory or English composition, no college museums of natural history, no college libraries for the undergraduate. When we realize what these things mean in our colleges to-day and remember that sixty years ago the student depended altogether on his literary society for them we begin to realize what the literary societies have done for the students of our colleges, and especially for those of Franklin and Marshall College. The supplying of these things by the college, and rightly so, is, I believe, the chief cause of the diminished interest taken in the societies by the undergraduates. Fraternities and athletics are also assigned as causes, but these are largely auxiliary. But the societies have done more for their men than to do the work now done by the college. They have given the men a training in parliamentary practice and debate, in the management of the affairs of the society, that is of the utmost value to

every man. Such things as these train men for leadership. For this nothing in the college course can well take its place, and in this direction and in the cultivation of social democratic features to a greater extent than has been done in the past, there is still a great future for these societies at Franklin and Marshall.

In the old days almost every graduate of the college belonged to one of these societies, but with the great increase in the number of students in recent years the large membership made the societies unwieldy. A large membership meant meetings of such length that few persons would care to endure them; for think what it means to be obliged to hear twenty men or more speak at a single meeting, in addition to the routine business. The other alternatives were to put fewer men on the programmes for each meeting, which meant that a man's turn on the programme came but a few times a year (perhaps two or three times in four years for debate), too seldom to be of much service to him, or to divide the society into sections, both meeting at the same time for their literary exercises, thereby destroying something of the society's solidarity.

The effort of some years ago on the part of the authorities of the college to force men into the societies resulted in loading them down with dead wood—a lot of members whose chief interest was to prevent a quorum or to vote an adjournment. It does not take many such members to kill any organization. The societies should include in the privilege of membership, for it is a privilege for any man, only those who take an active interest in their work. Persistent non-workers should be forced out, if by any chance they have managed to get in.

The literary societies of Franklin and Marshall College have a future of great usefulness before them, but they should plainly recognize changed conditions, which, indeed, they have to some extent. The societies are not called upon to do the work they did generations ago, for the college is now doing it better than they ever could; and the attempt to do it will only result in making them still more unwieldy. They should

emphasize the practice of debate and skill in parliamentary practice, two things that can be best learned at college in the free democracy of the student body. The ability to debate and to preside over a deliberative body, large or small, are two things that every college man ought to strive to get. No two things will be of greater practical use to him in after life, if he means to exert an influence on men.

Many Franklin and Marshall College men have said that the training they received in the literary societies was of more value to them than the training in the class room. That is true to this extent: in the literary societies they learned directly to apply and to test much of what was taught them, without waiting to apply that test after leaving college. In this respect—as testing laboratories—the societies serve the most useful purpose of permitting a man to measure his abilities and limitations. Here he can learn to know himself and to discover what he is best fitted for. A number of names might be mentioned of men whose whole future careers were influenced in this way. They “found themselves” in the literary societies.

The following table shows the whole number of students in college by decades, the number of members and non-members of the literary societies, and the number of members of each society, percentages of non-members, etc. The data with reference to the membership of each society were furnished by the societies; and though there may be inaccuracies due to the conditions of the society records, there is reason to believe that the statistics are substantially correct. The inaccuracies that may be discovered will tend to increase the number of society members. Non-graduates are counted according to the year they entered college, because many of them were special students and not connected with any class.

Perhaps the most striking thing in this table is that the decade in the history of the college when the largest percentage of men were in the literary societies was so recent as the decade of 1883–1892. Of the graduates of this period 99.5

MEMBERS OF THE LITERARY SOCIETIES BY DECADES, ETC.

	Whole Number of Graduates.	Goetheans—Graduates.	Diagnostians—Graduates.	Members of Neither Society—Graduates.	Per cent of Non-Members—Graduates.	Whole Number of Non-Graduates.	Goetheans—Non-Graduates.	Diagnostians—Non-Graduates.	Members of Neither Society—Non-Graduates.	Per cent of Non-Members—Non-Graduates.	Whole Number of Students.	Whole Number of Goetheans.	Whole Number of Diagnostians.	Whole Number of Members of Societies.	Whole Number of Non-Members of Societies.	Per cent of Non-Members.
1837-52	188	95	86	7	3.7 %	205	58	89	58	28.3 %	393	153	175	328	65	16.5 %
1853-62	166	104	58	4	2.4	130	34	38	60	46.1	296	138	94	232	64	21.6
1863-72	139	82	52	5	3.6	80	26	37	17	21.3	219	108	89	197	22	10.5
1873-82	174	102	67	5	2.9	93	18	42	33	35.5	267	120	109	229	38	14.3
1883-92	221	117	103	1	.5	110	40	53	17	15.5	331	157	156	313	18	5.4
1893-1902	345	189	120	36	10.4	299	101	59	139	46.5	644	290	179	469	175	27.2
Total.	1233	689	486	58	4.7	917	277	316	324	35.3	2150	966	802	1768	882	17.8

NOTE.—The decade 1893-1902 includes all the undergraduates now in college.

per cent. were members of the literary societies; and of all the students who attended college at that time 94.6 per cent. were members. This was the decade of most intense activity in athletics, the decade during which the gymnasium was built, the decade of successive most successful football teams. It will also be noted in the table that of the graduates who did not join either society 36, or 62.1 per cent., belong to the decade of 1893-1902. Of all the graduates of Marshall and Franklin and Marshall, 95.3 per cent. were members of the literary societies, as were 82.2 per cent. of the whole number of students. Another noticeable feature of the table is that of the society members who graduated, 689, or 58.6 per cent., were Goetheans, while only 486 were Diagnosthians, or 41.4 per cent. Of the society members who did not graduate 277 were Goetheans and 316 Diagnosthians, or 46.7 per cent. and 53.3 per cent., respectively. This is because a much larger proportion of the Goetheans have entered the ministry and have had financial assistance. Of the 689 graduate members of this society, more than 300 have entered the ministry, or about 45 per cent.; whereas only about 35 per cent. of the whole number of graduates have entered the ministry.

A study of the names in compiling these tables leaves no doubt that the men who come out of these two societies either had before joining the societies, or received in them, a certain bent which is noticeable in the aggregate. Will you say it is mere chance that the three graduates of the college who have been Attorney Generals of States—A. K. Syester, 1849, H. K. Douglas, 1858, and W. U. Hensel, 1870, were all Diagnosthians? or, that N. C. Schaeffer, 1867, Superintendent of Public Instruction of Pennsylvania, T. M. Balliet, 1876, Superintendent of the Public Schools of Springfield, Mass., E. L. Kemp, 1881, and A. C. Rothermel, 1891, Principals of State Normal Schools, were Goetheans? Twenty of the Franklin and Marshall men (2.2 per cent. of the men living at the time) are noted in the last edition of *Who's Who in America*. Five of these are presidents of colleges and four

of the five are Goetheans. The fifth one, who is a dentist with a national reputation, is the president of a dental college. The late Governor Hartranft and the late John H. Thomas, the millionaire manufacturer and candidate for the United States Senate from Ohio, were Diagnothians. The mind of the lawyer is essentially that of the logician; and the mind of the logician is manifest in the work of our own Dr. E. V. Gerhart, one of the founders of the Diagnothian Society at the High School at York, in June, 1835.

The literary societies of Franklin and Marshall College not only train their members in various literary exercises, but in the aggregate they put the stamp of their own individuality upon their men. Than this there can be no better test of their influence and their worth.

IX.

FACTS AND LESSONS FROM OUR EDUCATIONAL HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN C. BOWMAN, D.D.

A careful study of our educational history discloses a series of facts which may serve as a profitable object lesson for our contemplation as we approach the Jubilee Festival of Franklin and Marshall College. If the commemorative occasion is to serve its best purpose we need something more than the pleasant banquetings of Commencement Week and the complacent glorying over past achievement and present attainment. To do successfully the work of the present and the greater work of the future we need to study ourselves in the light of our defects and failures as well as in the more favorable light of our partial and, in some instances, complete successes. While we have cause to rejoice over what has been accomplished, we need to set ourselves to the important task of doing the greater things which come within the range of our capability, and which demand accomplishment. To this end we need the correction of kindly criticism in order that we may steer clear of the obstructions which hitherto have, in no small degree, impeded our progress. We have a heritage of which we are justly proud; we have also a heritage that maketh ashamed. The former we would perpetuate; the latter we should amend, and, if possible, discontinue. It shall, therefore, be my aim in the present paper to set forth a series of facts, drawn from our history, which shall serve the purpose of exhibiting the cause of both our successes and our failures in the management of our educational work.

As our Seminary and College are of common origin, and throughout their history have been wedded by a common life and love, the line of distinction between the two shall not be

specially regarded in this discussion. The facts and lessons cited will be found to apply with equal force to both institutions.

THE BEGINNINGS.

I place emphasis on the plural, for the reason that the beginnings were numerous. The first beginning is found in the plan for a Theological Seminary projected by the Synod of 1817, repeated in 1818, with increased emphasis in 1819, and with an outburst of enthusiasm in 1820. By the Synod of 1820, at Hagerstown, Dr. Philip Milledoler was elected Professor at an annual salary of two thousand dollars—a generosity highly creditable to the Synod. The Synod, however, failed to make provision for buildings or equipment, or to take any steps toward securing an endowment fund. There was no treasury, nor any need of one, for there was not a dollar at hand. It was innocently hoped that provision in large part, if not fully, would be made for the payment of the promised salary by personal friends of Dr. Milledoler in New York. Dr. Milledoler declined—not strange to say. Efforts were renewed from year to year until 1824, when, by the action of the Synod at Bedford the first foundation-stone, in fact, was laid by the casting vote of Dr. William Hendel. “*Ich stimme für Seminar*” cost Dr. Hendel much more than the odium and bitter opposition of a large part of Synod, and the suffering which resulted from the estrangement of personal friends. In the face of opposition and persecution Dr. Hendel followed up his vote by continuous effort in behalf of the movement, expending much time and labor, and more than a thousand dollars of his personal funds for the establishment of the Seminary. From the foundation of the Seminary at Carlisle in 1825 to its planting at Mercersburg in 1837, Dr. Hendel proved a worthy champion of the cause of education. For his devotion, abundant labors and many sacrifices, we honor the memory of the noble pioneer. To Dr. Hendel we accord the honor of having been the first leader in the history of our institutions who taught the les-

son how to succeed. One year of action in the field accomplished what seven previous years of synodical resolution and enthusiasm failed to accomplish. In these early beginnings we find the origin of the two hereditary lines which may be traced down to the present day. The one illustrates the method how to succeed; the other illustrates the method how not to succeed. It would not, however, be entirely fair to draw the line of contrast so sharply as to throw the weight of value exclusively on the one side. The seven years, referred to, which seem to have been fruitless, may not be regarded as barren years. They were years of earnest thought, desire and prayer; but that thought, desire and prayer may accomplish the end in view, they must be converted into action. Dr. Hendel in large measure impersonated the spirit of the body which he represented, but his leadership consisted mainly in his ability to execute the thought and purpose of that body. His example of administrative effectiveness points the moral of the present paper.

The four years of struggle for existence at Carlisle, followed by the eight years of similar experience at York; the founding of the High School at the latter place; its removal to Mercersburg in 1835, and its re-establishment there under the name of Marshall College, followed by the Seminary in 1837—all fall properly under the head of *beginnings*. From 1837 we look backward over a history of twenty years of beginnings; and from the same point we look forward through twenty-five to thirty years more before we find the era of beginnings closed. For the institutions at Mercersburg were not firmly rooted when the necessity and opportunity arose for their removal to their present permanent abode at Lancaster.

How shall we account for this prolonged period of painful struggle for existence? The literature covering the period is burdened with lamentations of distress, and constant cries for relief. At times a ray of cheerful light breaks through the clouds, only to be followed by deeper gloom. Time and

again Professors, crushed down by discouragement, threatened to vacate their positions, and, in more than one instance, relinquished their work out of sheer despair. Nor were they weak men, lacking in devotion, and undisciplined to hardship and sacrifice. We are wont to hear that "there were giants in those days"; and we pass on the tribute unquestioned from generation to generation. I make bold to state that in point of the intellectual and moral strength of their founders, our Seminary and College enjoyed an advantage second to no institutions of similar character that have been established in America. We do not therefore look to the internal side of our institutions for the cause of their sluggish growth, either in their earlier or later history. The precarious condition of the Seminary at Carlisle and at York was not due to the fact that Dr. Mayer was the sole professor. Rather should we say that its strength lay chiefly in the personality, devotion and ability of the one man. We need consult no other source than the literary legacy he has left to the church, for evidence of his broad culture as a scholar and teacher. It is much too brief a reference to the valuable labors of this most worthy founder to make but passing mention of his thirteen years of active service in the Seminary, and of the devotion of his best energies in its behalf to the close of his life. In this Jubilee year it is but just to repeat with increasing gratitude the tribute paid to his memory by one of his successors in office forty years ago. "To Dr. Mayer, perhaps, more than to any other man, to his labors and influence as pastor, to his industry, perseverance, zeal and ability as professor, is the church indebted for the origination and establishment of our educational institutions."

The High School at York, from its foundation to its planting at Mercersburg under the name of Marshall College, was a great school in a most real sense. While it assumed the modest name of a High School, from the outstart it ranked with the Colleges of its own day, and, in the general character of its course of instruction, far outranked many of the pro-

fessed Colleges of our day. In the second year of its history, it was said of it by one capable of judging, that "no school in America offered superior, if equal advantages, for thorough classical training." The examination of its schedule of studies prescribed for its curriculum, published in *The Messenger*, lends sanction to the high compliment. When the High School assumed the name of a College at Mercersburg no one questioned its right to the larger title. It was a *one man college*, although there were associated with him assistants of no mean ability. The one man was Dr. Rauch, the scholar whose literary, scientific and philosophical knowledge has not been exaggerated by his pupils, colleagues and admirers. The farther we are removed from him, the more are we impressed by the magnitude and scope of his learning. To him more than to any other are we indebted for the distinctive features of our educational heritage—a firm philosophical foundation, thorough discipline, and a comprehensive culture, whose aim is not simply the training of mind, but the education of the *man* in the totality of his powers. After a few months' acquaintance with him, Dr. Nevin recognized in the President of Marshall College "one who, in solid learning, was not surpassed by any college president in this country." A more intimate acquaintance with his colleague increased this high estimate. In the eulogy delivered shortly after his death he said: "Had Dr. Rauch lived five years longer, by his eminent scholarship he would have lifted himself and the college over which he presided, into prominent recognition before the educational world." Such recognition had already been accorded him by many of the leading colleges of our country. In the *Biblical Repertory* (Princeton) of 1840, we read: "If our German brethren are not dead to their own interest as a separate branch of Christ's church, to say nothing of their national feeling, they will not allow Marshall College to languish for lack of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars. With their accomplished President and the other learned gentlemen gathered around him, there

can be no doubt of success, if the spirit of Christian enterprise be not wanting. We cherish the hope that this institution will, in course of a few months, be placed on as firm a foundation as any college in the state or country." The same journal pays no less a tribute to the colleague of Dr. Rauch. "Dr. Nevin is a gentleman in whose talents, erudition and piety, this school has gained a high prize." The mere mention of the name of Nevin in this connection is sufficient to strengthen our devotion to the memory of another founder, whose greatness as a scholar, theologian, philosopher, historian and teacher, is valued with increasing appreciation from generation to generation. Then comes Schaff, with the vast contributions of his mind and the widely extended fame, which are associated with his name. *Rauch, Nevin, Schaff*—these names alone add confirmation doubly strong to the statement I have made, that no educational institutions of our country have been more highly favored in the intrinsic excellence of their founders than our own institutions of the Reformed Church. Without adding to the list of names, we need simply follow on down along the line of honorable succession to deepen the sense of just pride which we experience as we contemplate the history that has been made, and is being made, by our educational institutions. Upon this side, the internal side of our history, it is grateful to dwell. In it we have ever gloried, and still do glory. Nor do we undervalue the facts and lessons which come so prominently into view as we study this phase of our history.

But there are other facts, not so well known, which have entered into our history, and which need to be studied and interpreted if we would rightly know our history, ourselves, and the work that lies before us. These facts lie along the other line of heritage, already referred to—a heritage over which we cannot glory, but of which we have cause for humiliation. To bring into prominence these facts, and to impress their lesson, may seem an ungracious task; but the lesson needs to be learned. Institutions cannot live on the brains

of its professors, not even of a Rauch, a Nevin and a Schaff. They need besides the helpful hearts and hands of a faithful constituency. To bring and hold together these two essential factors requires the constant exercise of practical judgment and administrative talent. The omission or neglect of this connecting link, or, on the other hand, its wise employment, furnishes the key to the explanation of the facts which I shall now review.

The promise of a two thousand dollar salary to the first professor-elect dwindled into but one third of the original intention when the first professor, in fact, was installed.

In 1825 the capital of the Seminary consisted of \$3,000 and a Library of about one hundred volumes. In 1826 the funds were "supposed to amount to \$8,000," only part of which was productive. Even this small endowment was not obtained from the immediate constituency. It was secured mainly through the efforts of

Rev. James R. Reily,

who was commissioned as agent to go to Europe for the purpose of securing such aid in the fatherland as the churches might bestow. Rev. Reily was peculiarly well qualified for his mission by virtue of his keen intelligence, cheerful geniality and indomitable energy. From various parts of Holland, Germany and Switzerland he gathered the large sum of \$5,000, and upwards of 4,000 volumes for the library—a credit to the faithful and liberal hearts of the Reformed brethren abroad, as well as to the tact and energy of the zealous agent.

I make prominent the name of Rev. Reily, not only because of the invaluable services which he rendered in behalf of the Seminary at a critical period, but more especially because of the important lesson he taught at that early day: that the effusive synodical enthusiasm of a day, to be of any avail, must be followed by enthusiasm of action. It was a lesson which the Church was slow to learn; which it yet needs to learn.

Unfortunately the vigorous efforts of Rev. Riley abroad were not seconded by similar efforts at home. It seemed to be imagined that the stream of benevolence, opened up in Europe, would be a continuous source of supply for many years to come. The Synod appealed to the Classes for their coöperation, but to little purpose. Collections during the year 1827 were confined to the efforts of four Charges, amounting to *fifty-eight dollars and eighty cents*. The capital was drawn upon to meet current expenses, with the discouraging prospect, as the Professor wrote, that "with such management, in a short time, there would be neither capital nor Seminary to manage." Under a sense of painful disappointment the Professor plead for the maintenance of the life of the institution. "Kind words," said he, "and prayers to trust in Divine Providence are numerous. Resolutions indeed are obtained, but are afterwards neglected and forgotten. When the year is passed away we meet again, and new resolutions are adopted; but nothing is done. Is it possible to manage things worse?" This deplorable condition was not due to the poverty of the churches, nor to opposition on the part of the people to the cause of education. The need then, as in later times, was that of efficient leadership, effective organization and persistent work.

It was very fortunate that at this juncture, when our educational work was threatened with failure, there arose a leader in the person of

Rev. Jacob Beecher.

Rev. Beecher had been reared under the pastoral care of Rev. Reily, and had become imbued by his spirit. By his efforts, while pastor of the churches of Shepherdstown and Martinsburg, Virginia, was founded the first Educational Society of the Reformed Church. Along with the name of Rev. Beecher should be coupled that of his parishioner, Elder Jacob Myers. Mr. Myers proposed the plan of raising a fund of ten thousand dollars by securing one hundred pledges of one hundred dollars each, his own name heading the list.

In the winter of 1828-29, Rev. Beecher with true missionary zeal devoted himself to the work of raising the proposed fund. In less than four months the total amount was secured. The record of pledges contains the names of one hundred and one subscribers of one hundred dollars each, together with a long list of smaller contributions. The canvass was confined to the churches of Maryland, Virginia and Southern Pennsylvania. The larger and wealthier part of the Synod was not solicited to take part in the work. "The subscriptions were readily obtained as the free-will offerings of an enlightened zeal for the interests of the church." So wrote an appreciative layman of that period. Rev. Beecher, although in feeble health, braved the inclemency of the winter and the hardship of travel, not counting his health—not even his life—too great a sacrifice for the educational interests of the church. His early death at the age of thirty-two was hastened by unselfish disregard for his personal comfort while zealously prosecuting his work. Several years after his death, Dr. Nevins, referring to his services, wrote: "The early failure of our educational effort was averted through the exertion of Rev. Beecher to raise an endowment of ten thousand dollars. The movement was triumphantly successful. It was considered a great work; it was so in fact. The German church had never done so much before. This formed an epoch in her history. The money thus raised was worth more than five times as much as would have been collected in Europe or New England. It was a pledge that her strength would yet be consecrated, with a harvest of far richer results, to the praise of God."

The historians of our church and her institutions have failed to accord due recognition to the man whose self-sacrificing labors were the means of continuing, if not of saving, the life of our Seminary at the time of greatest peril. It is with a sense of belated justice that, in this connection, and in this commemorative year, I write large the name of Rev. Beecher. We should honor him as a leader, who, in the early days of

struggle and dark forebodings, pointed the way to the successful management of the educational work of the church.

Unhappily the movement so successfully conducted and completed by Mr. Beecher, and which promised so much for the future, was followed by a relapse into the former state of repose and inaction. There were, at times, fitful starts which blossomed with much show and promise, but which yielded no substantial fruit.

The removal of the Seminary and College to Mercersburg necessarily involved the construction of buildings and an increased endowment; but for lack of both the institutions were constantly hampered and crippled in their work. It was no light temptation, therefore, that confronted Dr. Rauch in 1836, when he was elected and called to the Professorship of Biblical Literature in Western Reserve College. For his retention at Mercersburg the church and the institutions are largely indebted to the personal influence and untiring labors of

Rev. Henry L. Rice.

In 1837 Rev. Rice became pastor of the church at Chambersburg, and, until the time of his death, served as President of the Board of Trustees. Like Rev. Beecher, his interest in behalf of the institutions was shown by continuous efforts in his own Charge and those of adjacent Classes. His two intelligent parishioners, Elders Heyser and Wolff, stood ever by his side—staunch and zealous supporters of every interest of the church. Together they formed a trio whose influence was felt, and continues to be felt, throughout the church. Rev. Rice died at the age of forty-two, his last words being a message of love and comfort to the professors at Mercersburg. "The influence of the spirit of the heavenly minded Rice wrought with happy effect upon the character of Dr. Rauch, forming, as he gratefully acknowledged, an epoch in his religious history" (Dr. Nevin). In the Biblical Repertory of 1840, Rev. Rice is credited with being "one of the most active founders of the institutions at Mercersburg." Our

own historical literature, for some cause, seems to pass over his valuable services with but scant, if any, notice. In the present review, which aims to give prominence to the principle of successful leadership, the name of Rev. Rice is entitled to high and honorable rank.

The Centenary.

The movement which next merits attention is one which conspicuously illustrates how a worthy cause, born of high resolve, popularly approved, and aided by strong and zealous supporters, may, nevertheless, end in inglorious failure.

Maryland classis, always to the front, submitted to the Synod of 1840, at Greencastle, a request for the observance of a centenary celebration, commemorative of the establishment of the Reformed Church in this country. The proposition was accepted by the Synod with enthusiasm. It was "Resolved that in reliance upon Almighty God we put forth our united efforts to raise at least *one hundred thousand dollars* for the institutions of the Church, and that subscription papers be opened in each pastoral charge for this purpose." The cause was vigorously championed by Dr. Nevin, who regarded the \$100,000 scheme as "neither extravagant nor absurd." To his mind it would be "a monument fit to plant on the threshold of the new century. It was not to be questioned by any intelligent person that the Reformed Church could easily, in a year's time, roll off the reproach of past days, and place the institutions on a foundation as solid as any in the land." Referring, at a later time, to the "Rhine Princes with their broad acres," he said: "We have in the German Reformed body a hundred men who easily might give a thousand dollars each without being made perceptibly poorer by the offering, men, too, whose hearts are already sufficiently large and liberal for so generous a gift, if only they were brought to see fully the vastness of the interest which such a movement may be expected to secure. If only we can be brought to will great things in this case, they may be consid-

ered as already ours." Still later he adds: "The Reformed Church is fully equal to the task. We have upwards of one hundred ministerial charges, every one of which could raise in one year's time one thousand dollars by only moving, as we say, its little finger for the purpose."

The committee appointed by the Synod to prepare a circular letter to the ministry and laity in behalf of the movement, expressed their belief that "the church is equal to ten times as great a work, if it were attempted." They asked that the donations "double the amount called for, and expressed the hope that on Christmas, 1841, a general thanksgiving be held, when this work will be solemnly completed and all the benefactions of the year put together in common mass." The disposition of the fund was prearranged; the Seminary, College and Educational Society were to receive each its just proportion.

The Messenger, for months, teemed with articles full of ardent hope and glowing zeal. The editor commended the plan as "exceedingly feasible and easy of execution." Before his eyes figures rolled up in amazing proportions. "Five hundred congregations, giving five hundred dollars each, would yield *two hundred and fifty thousand dollars*." Three Classes are named as "Easily capable of raising sixty thousand dollars, and four others a similar amount." With confident assurance he asks: "Who will say that one hundred thousand dollars is too large an amount? Rather, who will say that one hundred and fifty thousand, or even two hundred thousand dollars cannot easily be raised during our centenary effort?" One writer deplored the smallness of the amount aimed at. "How mean, how little it looks! In view of the ability of the Church, how unworthy is it!" With the opening of the campaign Dr. Nevin visited Eastern Pennsylvania and found that "the people did not regard the one hundred thousand proposition as at all formidable." It was rumored that "East Pennsylvania Classis alone would raise \$25,000."

In the course of his visit, "without any effort to engage

subscriptions, five individuals made themselves responsible for \$500 each." Appeal was made to the loyalty and devotion to the Church, that they might eclipse the zeal for political party. Dr. Nevin urged men to show a like zeal for the cause of Christ and Christian education as they showed for their favored candidate Van Buren or the hero of Tippecanoe. "A single convention cost \$100,000. Shall the German Reformed Church refuse to do as much for God?" The enthusiasm of the great theologian was shared by a large following. Never was there greater unanimity of sentiment. The movement spread from Classis to Classis and from Charge to Charge. Mercersburg Classis was the first to resolve "by the help of God to raise \$30,000." Maryland Classis resolved to make "a suitable effort to raise at least \$25,000." Charges vied with one another in their zeal to further the project. Chambersburg reported \$3,200 pledged with but little effort. Lebanon, \$3,300 "after only four days' work, with the prospect of raising the sum to \$6,000." Frederick, Hagerstown, Waynesboro, Cavetown, Middletown, Baltimore, Easton, Boalsburg, and other charges were aflame with the enthusiasm of the hour, each reporting large returns. Thus the high tide continued during the year of 1840 and the early part of 1841. Never was a movement launched with better intention or more sincere purpose. It did not enter into the mind of its earnest advocates that the project might possibly become engulfed under the great wave of enthusiasm. But the ebb soon followed. The voices so vigorous with hope were subdued to a minor strain. "If the centenary does not go forward with spirit and effect, the fault will not be that of the people," wrote Dr. Nevin. Another put it more positively: "The success of the movement depends entirely upon the attitude of the ministers." Later on gloomy doubt darkened the sky. "Will the one hundred thousand dollars ever be raised?" "Why does the movement lag?" "Centenary! Centenary!! Centenary!!! Very little said; still less done." Such, at intervals, were the wailing notes that

were raised. The Synod of 1841 resolved that the centenary operations be extended through the next year. The great Thanksgiving over the glorious completion of the work, set for Christmas, 1841, was not then observed, nor ever afterward. The Classes in 1842 either reported declining interest or were altogether silent in regard to the project. In 1843 Maryland Classis alone made mention of the centenary operations. The work which was to be "easily accomplished in one year," was not accomplished in twelve years. The summarized report of 1853 showed that little more than one third of the one hundred thousand dollars were secured for the institutions; and that fully twenty-five thousand dollars pledged was lost through reckless book-keeping. It is little wonder that the great scholar, Nevin, who at the outstart laid hold of the movement with all the vigor of his mind and the innocent hopefulness of his heart, should bewail the deplorable condition of the church, as he did a few years later. "The great sin of the German Church is covetousness. The duty of giving is little understood. The whole church, taxing her energies in a centenary enterprise with an effort that is made to stretch itself over five years, has not been able to raise as much money for the great objects she has had in view, as a single miserable foreign female dancer has drawn into her hands in less time by simply pandering to the public sensuality. Many congregations give almost nothing towards religious interests of a public character. Rich farmers, who profess to have devoted themselves spirit and body to Jesus Christ, would count it an intolerable tax to pay ten dollars to the cause of Missions, for which Christ died. And where such narrowness prevails with regard to objects of a general nature, a niggardly feeling is sure to appear also in the support of the Gospel at home." These words, it should be remembered, were written under the sting of bitter disappointment, and did not present an entirely just analysis of existing conditions. The "triumphantly successful work of Rev. Beecher," and the many later evidences of the liberality

of the "German Church," serve as a truer basis for an estimate of the character of the Reformed people than the relative failure of the centenary cause. But the gloom and disheartenment of the learned Doctor were not entirely subjective. No professor can comfortably occupy his chair in the presence of an empty treasury.

In 1849 so much as \$7,000 had been drawn from the endowment fund for the purpose of meeting current expenses. In 1850, \$2,250 were due on account of professors' salaries. Surely, as reported, "a most solemn crisis had been reached, which might well startle the most sanguine friends of the Church." The deplorable situation constrained Dr. Nevins to give notice of his purpose to resign his office. Dr. Schaff at the same time suggested the propriety of his withdrawal in consequence of "the straitened condition of the treasury." The following year, 1851, the former, after eleven years of distinguished service, carried his purpose into effect by submitting his formal resignation, on the ground that "the Church was not prepared to carry out the idea of a Theological Seminary with two professors in a truly earnest way; that he deemed it advisable that the Church reduce its views and efforts to the measure of this necessity." Dr. Schaff continued his services a few years longer, and then, for other assigned reasons, withdrew.

It was no comfort to the Synod to be informed by the Board of Trustees that the cause of the distress was to be found in "the unfaithfulness of the Church in general in regard to its repeated plans and most solemn obligations"; and that "a deeply mortifying lethargy seemed to pervade the Church, which, unless proper remedies be applied, threatened premature dissolution." From year to year the published reports tell of "gross culpability and negligence," of accumulating debts which, "like an incubus overhangs the institutions"; and that "the continuance of the policy would be an everlasting disgrace to the Church." But notwithstanding such discouragements, the Synod was ever ready to

devise large and liberal things. It was a worthy and sacred impulse that inspired the resolution, shortly after the death of Dr. Rauch, to rear a fitting memorial under the name of "The Rauch Professorship." Later, the title was changed to "The German Rauch Professorship." So, to this day, the memorial stands; or, I should rather say, lies buried.

We should not, however, in the study of the history of the beginnings of our institutions, fail to make due mention of what in fact was accomplished in their behalf. Bernard C. Wolff, as elder, pastor and professor, allowed no discouragements to lessen his constant and efficient efforts in the struggle for the maintenance of both the Seminary and College. Likewise to the untiring labors of Dr. J. C. Bucher are the institutions largely indebted for their present state of advancement. The history of the removal of the institutions to Lancaster, involving an increased outlay of labor and money, and of their gradual enlargement during recent years, need not now be recounted. But the many gratifying evidences of progress, which to-day confront our eyes, should not fail to remind us of the fruitful labors of Reverends J. W. Steinmetz, C. U. Heilman and Ambrose M. Schmidt. Each one of these names, as connected with the history of the Seminary or College, adds emphasis to the lesson that successful results are commensurate with efficient and wisely directed effort. Nor should we ever lose sight of the immense service and encouragement afforded by the large benefactions of Daniel Kieffer, Miss Ann E. Keller, the "Plainfield Bond" contributors, Mrs. Margaret Hood, Henry Wirt, Mrs. Rebecca Sparr, John L. Riegel, Gen. De Peyster, Charles Santee, B. C. Wolff, Jr., Jacob Y. Dietz, and many others whose names are gratefully cherished, though not here recorded.

In our review thus far facts have been cited which lie close to the parallel lines of partial success and partial failure. At times the measures proposed for the relief and advancement of the institutions were completely successful; at other times they resulted in total failure. These lines run through a long

period of well-nigh fifty years, which I have not incorrectly designated *the period of beginnings*. Throughout this period no question was ever raised as to the strength or efficiency of the teaching force of the institutions. The Boards of Management showed no lack of faithfulness to their office. The ministry were sometimes, though not always justly, charged with indifference and inactivity; while upon the laity was cast the reproach of covetousness and niggardliness. At no time, however, was failure ascribed to poverty. On the contrary, frequent references were made to the generally comfortable circumstances of the people, while many were repeatedly accredited with large wealth.

How are we to account for the marked difference in results, for success in some instances, and failure in many others? If there is any doubt as to the explanation which has already been indicated, the doubt should surely be put to rest by the outcome of the great epochal movement of 1863.

The Tercentenary.

The three hundredth anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism was an occasion worthy of commemoration on the part of the Reformed Church of all lands. To our own branch in the United States belongs the credit of having surpassed all others in the spirit and manner of its observance. No movement in the history of the Reformed Church in this country, before or since, was so completely crowned with success. In its organization and method of carrying out every detail, there seemed to be nothing lacking.

The addresses, delivered on the occasion of the Jubilee held in Philadelphia from January nineteenth to the twenty-third, were valuable contributions to our theological and historical literature. They fully merited the title under which they were published: "The Tercentenary Monument." By the side of it was placed, at the cost of much labor, the suitable memorial, "The Triglot Edition of the Heidelberg Catechism."

That all the people might have opportunity for their contribution to the Jubilee, provision was made for a free-will offering. Never was there a plan more thoroughly wrought out, more clearly defined, and more effectively executed. Classes, pastors, consistories were plainly told what to do. Care was taken to enlist the interest of every one. "Not a single man, woman or child should be overlooked. The offerings of a single penny from a poor child should be honored with the same respect as the princely offering of hundreds and thousands on the part of the rich. The opportunity of giving should be offered to all—to all." It was especially emphasized that all contributions should be regarded not as "collections from the people, but offerings by the people." Thirty thousand copies of the report, defining the significance of the celebration and the proposed manner of its observance, were printed for distribution, and each minister was instructed to read the report to his people from the pulpit. A special convention was held in Reading in May, 1864, to receive and announce the ingatherings of the free-will offerings. Reports were received from fourteen classes, embracing one hundred and sixty-seven charges.

The sum total amounted to *One Hundred and Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars*. Of this amount one hundred and eight thousand dollars were designated for the various interests of the Church—the Theological Seminary, Franklin and Marshall College, Heidelberg College and Seminary, Board of Education, Home Missions, Foreign Missions, Church Extension, Widows' Fund Society, Orphans' Home, and Mission Churches. Seventeen thousand dollars were undesignated, and were disbursed by the vote of the convention. In addition to the amounts presented for general benevolent purposes, nearly thirty-five thousand dollars were contributed for local charities. This large sum, nearly *One Hundred and Sixty Thousand Dollars*, was secured in the course of one year, without any noise or special plea. And this at a time when the country was distracted by war, and many of the people

impoverished by its ravages. How shall this amazing success be explained? The Tercentenary Jubilee does not explain it, though there was much in the occasion. The people of the Reformed Church, so susceptible, so appreciative, and, as a rule, so generous of heart, and yet so often misunderstood, misrepresented and maligned, were, in the year 1863, rightly instructed and wisely directed. Moreover, there was *wise and efficient leadership*. Back of that great, successful jubilee, and through it all, I discern the leadership of Dr. Henry Harbaugh.

The great poet-preacher knew the ministry and people of the Reformed Church, may I say, as no one before nor since. He was their interpreter. He knew how to win both their mind and heart, creating a free interchange of confidence. Along with his "*gemüthlichkeit*" he possessed administrative tact, skilled to execute what the mind had devised. In the Jubilee movement his spirit, rather than his person, was prominent, guiding and shaping the course of action from beginning to end. All pastors became leaders. And when pastors lead success is always assured.

That was a notable lesson, proving what great things can be easily accomplished by our ministry and people when there is wise direction, accompanied by concerted zealous action. But unfortunately the lesson, as in former and less conspicuous instances, was not turned to proper advantage. In the light of the Tercentenary triumph there is no suitable apology for the record of later years, which tells of so much begun and never done.

In 1866 a plan was devised by the Board of Trustees for raising not less than *two hundred thousand dollars* for meeting the needs of Franklin and Marshall College. It was unanimously agreed by the Synod "to raise at least one hundred thousand dollars toward the fuller endowment of the college." The resolution was fixed on the record—there to remain. In 1872 it was again agreed between the Board of Trustees and the Eastern Synod to raise one hundred thou-

sand dollars for the College. Something was done while the agent was in the field, but the results were small in comparison with the hopes that were raised.

The Alumni Professorship, so liberally endowed *by vote* in 1875—But why further uncover the wrecks of good resolutions which are scattered along the unfortunate line which runs through our history, enforcing the lesson how not to succeed? It were better, perhaps, that all this should be buried with the reproach that goes with it.

Now, once more to the brighter side, with its cheer and hope and inspiration. The Jubilee Year is always a time of rejoicing. And much cause have we to rejoice over what has been accomplished, and the prospect of the greater things in store. Within the last fifteen years *more than three hundred and fifty thousand dollars* have been contributed toward the Seminary and College for buildings, equipment and increased endowment. The Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College have not only planned largely and wisely for meeting the growing needs of the institution, but they can point with pride to very much that has been accomplished under their direction, and largely by their liberal financial aid. It is to the credit of the Board that in compassing the needs and the prospective work of the College they set before themselves and the constituency of the College the high mark of *Five Hundred Thousand Dollars*.

It indicates an appreciation of the needs and the merits of the College; and, at the same time, a faith in its constituency not beyond its capability, and, perhaps, not beyond its willingness.

Our College, as at present constituted, maintains high rank. While it has adapted its curriculum to the changed conditions and peculiar needs of our age, it has not departed from the lofty educational ideal which has been its distinctive badge throughout its past history. Its President, and the Professors in the several departments, by their broad culture and their character as men, are full worthy of the confidence

and high esteem in which they are held. Although there is need of larger teaching force and of a very considerably increased endowment, the College, nevertheless, is qualified as no other, to serve the educational interests of its immediate constituency. The semi-centennial Jubilee should mark an epoch in its history. The present generation is not held responsible for the defects and failures of the past; but the lessons of the past should teach us to avoid the continuance of methods which have been a serious hindrance to our progress. We are responsible for the work of the present, and for the part we take in making provision for the larger demands of the future. At no time have too great things been planned for the support and advancement of the College. Nor is there at present any danger of abatement of high aspiration and noble intention. Our danger is in not holding on persistently to the completion of what has been begun. Both from a financial and moral standpoint it were far better to promise less and do more. Resolution should ever be the promise and pledge of execution. We need an *esprit de corps* that will fight the battle to the finish. May the Jubilee of Franklin and Marshall College introduce an era that shall be characterized by such administrative ability as shall rekindle and retain the enthusiasm and devotion of its entire constituency, ministry and laity, impelling them to the continuous support and advancement of our Alma Mater!

X.

THE ACADEMY AND THE COLLEGE.

PROF. EDWIN M. HARTMAN, A.M.

The secondary schools of this country originated as college preparatory schools. Harvard College was founded in 1636. The material development of the colony was so rapid and engrossing that educational and spiritual interests were in danger of being neglected. To avert this danger and to secure boys for Harvard the colony decreed, 1647, that every town of one hundred householders should set up a grammar school whose course of instruction should prepare for the college. The character of these preparatory schools was determined by the college from above. They therefore had a very narrow training that met the needs of only a small proportion of the people and consequently soon waned for want of support.

The place of these preparatory schools was partly taken by academies, whose end was in themselves, whose purpose was primarily to supplement the meager education of the common school and the home. These academies antedated most of the colleges and often served as a nucleus for their organization. Thus Philadelphia Academy, opened in 1751 through the influence of Benjamin Franklin, was soon chartered as a college and later as a university. This was the first institution in the country to bear the name academy. Franklin and Philadelphia served as a center from which the academy idea radiated throughout the colonies. In 1749 Franklin issued a pamphlet, "Proposals Relative to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania." In the *Journal of Education* (Vol. XXX.) we read: "After Franklin's pamphlet, which had a very wide circulation, the term academy and the institution itself became quite common. In many states before

1800 academies were established with boards of trustees and certain corporate powers after the plan of Franklin, and not a few of them bore his name." Our own Franklin "college," founded in 1787, the corner-stone of whose building was laid by Franklin, was one of these "academies."

At the founding of Marshall College, at Mercersburg, in 1836 it was provided that there should be two departments, a college department and a preparatory school. The next year we read of a preparatory school with Rev. Wm. A. Good as rector. At times the enrolment was as large as or larger than that of the college, and the school manifested quite a vigorous life. For some few years it was accommodated in an old frame building in the western part of the town. In 1840 this was destroyed by fire. The next year a new building was erected on ground purchased for the college in the southern part of the town. After the college was removed to Lancaster (1853) the preparatory school was continued at Mercersburg as Marshall Academy for two years, then passed into private hands, under whose management it was continued until the founding of Mercersburg College in . The rectors of the preparatory school during the Marshall College period were: Rev. Wm. A. Good, 1837-41; Rev. Andrew S. Young, 1841-43; Jeremiah H. Good, 1843-46; Rev. A. J. M. Hudson, 1846-50; Joseph S. Loose, 1850-51; David Snively, 1851-52; Clement Z. Weiser and Samuel G. Wagner, 1852-55.

The only catalogue ever published by Franklin College (1848) shows that a senior and a junior department were maintained, the latter doing work of the college preparatory grade.

Paralleling the first two years of Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster we find the "Franklin and Marshall High School" under the direction of Joshua Derr, 1852-54. The next year this work was under the direction of J. J. Naille. Then it was taken directly under the care of the college with the president of the college as principal of the

"preparatory department" from 1855 to 1867. During this period the responsibility was usually delegated to some member of the college faculty who did most of the teaching. Among these were Dr. Theodore Apple and Dr. Thomas Porter. During this period the preparatory boys were accommodated in one of the college class-rooms, for a time the small part partitioned off at the southern end of the mathematics room. The average annual enrolment for the first fifteen years was nineteen students. The department was then little more than a sub-freshman class. From 1867 to 1871 Frederick C. Gast was rector. In those four years the enrolment was more than doubled and the school secured quarters near the center of the town, one year on Duke Street near East King and two years on East King just west of Duke. Dr. Gast was followed by W. Howard Gutelius, who, after one year, was succeeded by Cyrus V. Mays. In 1872-73 a new building was erected for the department and its name changed to "Franklin and Marshall Academy." In the catalogue of 1872-73 we read "The Trustees at their last meeting resolved to make the school a separate and distinct institution, and, by making more ample provision for its efficiency, enlarge its usefulness both to the church and the college. Their aim is to make it, in the best and highest sense, a training school for those who desire to prepare for college, and also to furnish a complete academical course for those who do not purpose taking a full collegiate course of study."

The new building, the energy of Professor Mays and the stimulus which would naturally come with the sense of individuality and responsibility now felt by the separate school, all served to bring a greater measure of success to the new institution. Since that time it has been under the direction of the following men: Cyrus V. Mays, 1872-74; Daniel M. Wolff, 1874-75; Nathan C. Schaeffer, 1875-77; John S. Stahr, 1877-79; James Crawford, 1879-83; George F. Mull, 1883-85; W. W. Moore, 1885-97; Thaddeus G. Helm and Edwin M. Hartman from 1897 to the present time. In the

first twenty-five years of this period, from 1872 to 1897, about 225 boys were prepared for our own college and some for other institutions. It is unfortunate that there are practically no records through which we may now know more intimately the life and work of the Academy through all these years. The bare outline of historical facts gives us little idea of what the life of the institution really was. The names of the men in charge are, however, in themselves evidence of much faithful and effective work.

The advent of the present management marks a period when the Trustees and Faculty of the college perhaps more than ever felt the importance of a successful preparatory school where boys might receive a thorough training and sound, healthy culture under auspices morally safe and in sympathy with the genius of our church and the life of our college. Reformed boys preparing in schools that had little or no affiliation with our college were found to be drifting to other colleges. It was felt that these boys could best be secured and the interests of the college be best subserved by broadening the sphere and influence of the Academy. Much needed improvements were made in the building in the way of steam-heating, electric lighting, baths, refurnishing of rooms, etc. The whole building was made available for the use of the school. The capacity of the building for boarding students was doubled and soon every room was occupied. The increased proportion of boarders has changed the character of the student body. The work of the last six years has widened the Academy's sphere of influence, is holding for the college some boys who would be likely to drift elsewhere and is bringing in others who would otherwise not have been likely to secure a higher education at all. During the last five years it entered as many boys to the freshman class of the college as all other preparatory schools combined. At the same time it is now preparing at least half that many more for other courses at other institutions. In these five years about 150 boys have been entered at fifteen different

institutions where many have attained high rank and are competing successfully with other students from some of the best preparatory schools of the country. The preparation of these other students has, however, not detracted from the service rendered to the college. The purpose of the Academy always has been and always must be to serve the church and the college through which and for which it exists. How it may be most efficient in this service is the question that meets us as we turn away from the past and face the future for which we are planning and working.

In periods of great changes and rapid progress we must continually be discovering ourselves and adjusting our policies to the tendencies of the times if we would perform our mission with any degree of efficiency. The last ten years of the century just ended were a decade of remarkable change and progress in the sphere of secondary education in the principal countries of the world. If we would be in line with these changes we must look forward to a revision of our educational policy that shall give far greater recognition to our secondary schools. When I was called upon to write this article I naturally turned to the literature of the church to see what had been written on this subject by others in years gone by, and I could find practically nothing. In looking over the organized work of the church to see what has been done for the support of this sphere of her educational interests I find nothing that was at all commensurate with its importance. This oversight was more excusable and less detrimental to the best interests of our church and her educational work because until recently secondary education was so generally neglected. The child has been pretty well cared for in the elementary schools and the more mature youth has had his opportunities in the higher institutions of learning, but the adolescent boy, in the school as in the home, has been left largely to shift for himself as best he could. The educational conditions of this adolescent period have been chaotic the world over. Recently educators

have come to realize the importance and vantage ground of this period educationally both for the boy and for the nation.

For the boy this is in every respect a transition period, a second birth into a new life physically, mentally and morally. There is rapid growth and the foundations for the physical man are being laid for life. There is rapid increase of mental and nervous energy which must find proper means of exercise and channels for expression. The simple faith and love and obedience of childhood give way to reason and doubt and perversity that are easily misunderstood. New feelings, desires and ambitions are born that must be sympathetically met, encouraged and moulded. The opening life expands beyond the present and looks eagerly into the future where it is creating ideals that need to be high and healthy and holy. The new life also turns inward upon itself, becomes self-conscious, reflective and more subject to intense religious feelings and experiences than ever before or after. In every respect this secondary school period from thirteen or fourteen to seventeen or eighteen is for the boy a process of becoming. The mold in which he is cast in these years determines the man for life. If ever from the kindergarten to the university there is a period that needs wise, helpful, sympathetic and conscientious oversight and direction it is this adolescent period. If ever education is to weave a certain kind of genius and truth into the web of man's character and life it must begin here. First because it is the susceptible, formative period of life, and second because only a very small proportion of boys ever go beyond a secondary education. If it is true that the church has something peculiar to give to her sons through her educational system (and she has) then why not make better provision to begin giving it at this opportune time.

The state too is coming to realize the importance of secondary education for the welfare of her national life. The large mass of people never get more than an elementary education. A rapidly increasing number are now going through

the secondary schools. Compared with the rest, those who go through college are a very small number indeed, about one eighth of one per cent. in our country. The different countries are coming to realize that if they would put their national stamp on their citizens through education they must do it in the secondary schools. These are nearest the heart of the nation and of civilization. For the last ten years they have held the central place in the educational thought of the world, as is evidenced by the following efforts at school reform in this sphere: "The December Conference at Berlin in 1890 and the consequent revision of the Prussian curricula; the report of the Committee of Ten in our own country in 1894; the report of the English Parliamentary Commission on Secondary Education in 1895; and the establishment of the English Board of Education to give effect to the recommendations of this commission; the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, of our National Educational Association, in 1899; the report, in 1899 and 1900, of the Commission appointed by the French Chamber of Deputies; the Brunswick Declaration of 1900; and the other important acts and expressions growing out of the so-called Frankfort Plan."

This record of ten years' activity goes to prove that the importance of secondary education is being recognized as never before. We are going through a formative epoch in the history of these schools—an epoch which in our country is a period of wonderful progress. Since 1890 the attendance in these schools (mostly public) has increased about 225 per cent. Nothing like this can be seen in any other department of education.

But it is not only the public opinion of the principal culture nations that is waking up to the importance of secondary education. The same tendency is manifest in some of the religious denominations. The Catholic Church, which at one time cared mainly for the child and the adult, is now organizing secondary schools. The Quakers have realized

the value of this kind of education for generations and have signally benefited by their foresight. Their richly endowed and well-organized secondary schools have not only raised the whole membership of their church above their fellows in intellect and culture, but have leavened whole communities that have been within the sphere of their influence. The Friends' schools in and about Philadelphia are recognized as easily the most efficient educational agencies of their kind in that section. And though the policy of the Quakers has been to give a secondary education to their laity and their masses rather than a higher education to their ministry and the few, yet their higher institutions, Swarthmore, Haverford, Bryn Mawr, are flourishing; and this not in spite of, but just because of the greater interest in their secondary schools. These schools do not only encourage many a boy to secure a higher education who would otherwise not think of getting it, but they infuse throughout the whole body of their people an appreciation of and love for education that insures a ready and generous moral and financial support for all their institutions. Without these they would certainly not maintain the colleges they now do, and it is a question whether they would even continue to exist as a denomination. There is no other power that arms an individual or a people for the struggle for existence and perpetuation and assertion as does the conserving and animating power which education gives.

I have tried to show what a vantage ground for training the susceptible period of secondary education offers. How pregnant with varying possibilities it is. How vital beyond all others with reference to the future. I have tried to show what it may mean for an individual, for a denomination, or even for a whole nation that proper educational provision be made for the youth at this time. I have cited evidence that the interest in this period has gone beyond theory, and that educators, certain religious denominations and practically all the foremost nations of the world are giving practical expression to their convictions. I do not think any one will be

inclined to dispute the general facts I have tried to establish. They are generally recognized in theory, but in our church, as in many others, the conviction has not yet been general enough and strong enough to pass into action. The Reformed Church has always been a leader in systems of thought. There is no reason why she should not be the same in educational policy.

In the light of the foregoing facts I would modestly but seriously press the question whether our educational policy should not be considerably changed so that we might reach a far greater proportion of our boys through our institutions. The original end aimed at was to furnish an educated ministry for the church, the very purpose that gave rise to the majority of the older colleges of the country. At that time the ministerial career attracted the best and most ambitious youth of the land. The minister dominated not only the spiritual but even the secular interests of his community. Under these conditions an educational system might have its aim and scope determined by the ministerial career and still meet fairly the needs of the community and command its support. But conditions have changed. The ministerial career no longer to the same extent attracts the talent it formerly did. The minister no longer wholly dominates the spiritual, still less the secular, interests of his community. There may be a dozen or more laymen to every minister whose influence equals or probably surpasses his. If education is to have the support of these laymen it must be broadened so as to reach them also. The church that desires to impress the stamp of its genius upon her members and conserve in them her peculiar life will no longer seek to do it through her ministers alone. She will provide the elements of liberal culture and useful knowledge for all of her sons no matter what their future career may be. But she cannot thus mold her membership in the college alone, where but an insignificant proportion come under her educational influence. A well-equipped and well-endowed secondary school would reach and

influence a far larger proportion of the sons of the church, and would, in addition, serve as a means to bring far more of them under the influence of the college. All the tendencies of the present day point to this as a necessity. And yet for all that the church has done, with little exception, these schools would still be what they were in their earlier history, schools designed merely to furnish a pre-collegiate training for prospective college students. If they are in a measure prospering as such, or are widening their scope and influence, it is not by a process of healthy, natural growth with its causes in a sound basis, nor because of any financial support that has been given them by the church, but rather through unusual efforts on the part of a few individuals. In the degree that they must rely on themselves they will of necessity tend to serve the church and college less exclusively. That this is in a measure the case we of the secondary schools must confess, but it is not through any fault of ours. Statistics gathered from Mercersburg Academy, Franklin and Marshall Academy, Ursinus Academy and Reading Classical School for the year 1901-02 show the following results. Total enrolment for the year 503, of whom 28 per cent. are from Reformed families; total number graduated 139, of whom 29 per cent. were from Reformed families; total number of graduates entered college 94, of whom 29 per cent. were from Reformed families. Of the graduates from Reformed families 68 per cent. entered college. What inference shall we draw from these figures? They are certainly not what we should like to see. The enrolments have been materially increased within the last few years, but the increase has not been in Reformed boys. In the degree that this is true these schools have failed to render increased service to the church and her higher institutions. Only 28 boys out of a communicant membership of 255,000 entering college from the four largest preparatory schools of the church seems to indicate some defect in our system. Why does the church not reach more of her boys through these schools? Is it not because these schools must

practically maintain themselves with little or no aid in their competition with secondary schools aided by the state?*

Speaking for our Academy I can say without fear of contradiction from any one who knows through experience, that no secondary school can be properly equipped, properly manned, and properly run on the income from students at the rates that we are charging now. If the school were obliged to maintain a fair degree of efficiency and success for any length of time under the present conditions it would have to be at an expense of energy and a degree of sacrifice that should not be expected. When the present management took charge of the Academy they received hardly a word of hopeful encouragement from any source. A former principal who is capable of unusually effective work, who has made himself felt in educational work beyond our state and church, said to the writer: "I never worked so hard in all my life as I did while I had charge of the Academy, and never had such poor results for my efforts." We are sometimes asked why we do not raise our tuition and thus get more money for building up the school. This might be possible. A principal said to me recently: "I find it about as easy to fill my school at rates that are practically exclusive as I did with popular rates." A man connected with one of the best preparatory schools in Philadelphia said to me within the last month: "Our experience has been that every time we raise our rates we increase our enrolment, but we also change the character of the student body." Our experience indicates that we may not raise our rates beyond what they are now. If we do Reformed boys will go elsewhere or nowhere, and they are doing that too much now for us to serve the church and college as we should.

The above facts seem to indicate that it is necessary for the

* The thirteen State Normal Schools, which are now offering college preparatory courses in addition to their professional training, are this year receiving from the state an appropriation for tuition and maintenance which is the equivalent of the income from an endowment of \$6,500,000. A number of private secondary schools are also well endowed.

church to establish a well-equipped and well-endowed secondary school in order to keep under her own influence those of her sons who are looking forward to a higher education, and also to give opportunity and stimulus to many others who would otherwise get nothing more than an elementary training. It seems as though these schools would have to be partly supported through endowment by the church or practically pass out of her service. The latter the church and college could not afford.

I have in mind a secondary school in this state, heavily endowed, which educates the youth of its church at cost, or in exceptional cases at less than cost, and thus in the words of a member of that church "transforms whole communities by giving an education to those who would otherwise not have obtained it." This school admits no other students till all the applicants from its own church are accommodated, then it admits others, charging them a good rate. It takes its students as far as the sophomore year of the small college, then sends them back to their homes to live and work as an educated laity for the church to which they will always be grateful. Many another one, under the impulse received in this school, will go on to college who would otherwise never have thought of getting a higher education.

I believe that some such scheme for secondary education should be adopted by our church, and to be effective it should be begun with an investment of not less than \$200,000 in the thorough equipment and endowment of a centrally located school. I imagine I can hear the reader pronounce this visionary, impracticable, impossible. Not so. I believe that wisdom and foresight will find it not only advantageous but essential, and faith and energy can make it possible. The little canton of Zurich in Switzerland, the center of the Swiss Reformation which gave birth to our church, with an area one third less than that of Lancaster County, Pa., and an adult population considerably less than the communicant membership of our church, with resources that do not com-

pare with those of some of the stronger Reformed districts of our country—this little district maintains out of its own revenues a university, a veterinary school, a school of agriculture, two great classical schools, two great *Real Schulen*, a normal school for training primary and secondary teachers, 57 secondary schools and 365 primary schools; and many of these are of the best of their kind. Should not the example of this little birthplace of our church inspire us to do more for the cause of education and thus for the welfare of our church?

What would such an investment of money mean for the church and her institutions? The limited space allotted to me permits me to answer this merely in outline. In the first place it would mean the replacement of the old Academy building, which is entirely inadequate, unfit for its intended purpose and incapable of proper equipment, by a new building adapted to the needs of the school, comparing more favorably with the buildings of other schools of like kind, and no longer a source of disappointment to the new students who see it for the first time or a cause for complaint for the old ones. This must come and soon, whether the policy of a larger and endowed school be approved or not. Such a building would also be equipped for the work of the different departments so that none would be obliged to "make bricks without straw."

In the second place it would make it possible for us to pay salaries that would enable good teachers to prepare themselves properly for their work and look forward to it as a permanent career. If there ever is a time when a pupil needs a teacher with tact, skill, training and energy, it is during this vital secondary period when habits are formed and foundations are laid. No man should hold such a position who has not had some university and professional training. In Germany a university course and three years of professional study and practice are required before a man is eligible for such a posi-

tion. This is the equivalent of seven years' work beyond the sophomore year of our college. The feeling of the English schools was recently expressed in a resolution passed by the Head-Masters' conference urging upon prospective secondary school teachers the importance of university and professional training. I do not mean to say that we should immediately expect to realize the ideal set for the secondary teachers in Germany or even in English schools, but our universities are beginning to provide for it and the tendency fortunately is in the direction of such standards.

An endowment that would reduce the cost of tuition for our Reformed boys would help the cause of our secondary education largely by encouraging boys to give more time to this work. The present state of affairs is deplorable in this respect, especially as I know it in this state. The educational ideals of boys and parents are too sordid. It is valued and desired too largely for its power "to keep a coat on the boy's back," rather than for the better and truer ends that ought to prompt the student. With such ideals it is not surprising that boys are anxious to get this "power" in the shortest time possible. The college course is fixed at four years. If time is to be gained and money to be saved it must be in preparation, therefore the average student in this state is tempted to go to the school that will in the shortest time prepare him to "get into college." This is bad for both school and college, and worse for the boy. It means no broad substantial training in the school, no foundation on which the boy can build successfully in college, and therefore too much work and teaching of the secondary type in the college thus entered. In England many boys go up from the secondary schools to college with a good part of their college work done before they enter. Here the tendency is too much to enter "with conditions." For any secondary school of the church to set an ideal standard requiring ample time for its work regardless of the above circumstances would result, like the raising of

tuition to a paying basis for an unendowed school, in discouraging many boys who ought to be encouraged and in turning others to other schools. It seems to me manifest, therefore, without much demonstration that an endowment lessening tuition for boys in our secondary schools would tend to raise the standard of work in these schools and in the colleges as well; for after all the quality of the work in the former in a large measure determines the standard and success of the work in the latter, regardless of ideals which the college may set for herself.

In urging this policy of more prominence and support for our secondary schools I do not mean to detract one iota from the importance of the college and her interests. She needs all the support she asks for and should have it. She renders more and better service to the church than most of us realize, and maintains a standard of life and work that is a source of gratification and just pride for every alumnus. I have for some time had occasion and opportunity to know more or less of the life and work at a number of other institutions throughout our country, and all that I have learned of them has increased my respect for my own Alma Mater.

It may be thought by some that investing a large amount of money in secondary education would divert means from the college and thus conflict with her interests. On the contrary this seems to me the only means through which the college can rest on a sound basis and the church and college can mutually and truly serve each other's interests. What the church and college need to put their educational interests on a sound basis is not *agents* to go out and recruit students from any source whatever as some lately seem to think, but *agencies* to make students of our Reformed boys. There is no need for the church to make strenuous efforts to maintain a college for the sake of appearances, nor for the purpose of educating the general public. The former would be folly. The state will care for the latter. The mission of the college is

to the sons of the Reformed Church and the agencies to reach them are good, effective secondary schools. On these the college must rest or she will be like a pyramid standing on its apex, without foundation, supported with difficulty by mechanical props, and then not serving the church as she might and should. The public high schools cannot do the work of the secondary schools of the church in preparing boys for college or for life. In the first place only a very small proportion of Reformed boys have the advantage of high schools that prepare for college. But even if all the boys had such advantages it would still be to the interest of the church and her college to maintain their own schools. The public schools will not and dare not know any religion so long as there are religious denominations. But this is just the time when the boy is most susceptible to religious or any other kind of influences and, therefore, *the* time above all others when he should feel the molding power of the church if he is to receive its impress. If our boys at this age are given over to schools that know not the life and genius of our church and college their tendency will be to drift away from both.

But a scheme of endowed secondary education would perhaps do most for the church in giving opportunity and encouragement to hundreds of our worthy boys in rural districts who have in them the making of strong and useful men, but who at present have practically no educational outlook. A man who is prominent among the educators of this country said recently: "One of the great educational problems of the present day is that of bringing higher culture to the rural districts. We lose their help for lack of encouragement. I fear our present educational tendency is toward breeding a rural peasantry and an urban civilization." If this is true it requires little acumen to see what it will mean for our church with probably half of her membership in rural districts which offer little or nothing beyond an elementary education. And this all the more because of the fact that our church life is not characterized by obedience to superiors, or

blind faith in doctrine, or by emotionalism, but by the very education in respect to which such a large proportion of our membership is now being put at a disadvantage. If opportunity and stimulus could be given to bring more of these boys into our secondary schools many would ultimately go to college and reach spheres of usefulness of which they had not dreamed, and many more would return to their homes and leaven whole communities with a better type of life and ideals. Thus would the church be gradually raising the educational tone of her whole membership, insure the proper support of her institutions and through them the perpetuation of her own peculiar life and mission.

XI.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.

The colony and the college are the foundation of the American Republic. The English settlers in the North and in the South founded colleges after their homes were erected and their churches were built. The New Englanders were educational enthusiasts. Not all of them were educated but they were under the leadership of scholars in church and state. The twenty thousand Englishmen, who settled in New England from 1620 to 1640, had eighty ministers among them. About one half of these were graduates of Cambridge or Oxford University. Some of the more prominent divines were invited to attend the Westminster Assembly and take part in the reconstruction of the English Church. No wonder, then, that the townsmen of Massachusetts and Connecticut contributed their peck of Indian corn for the support of poor students at Harvard, at a time when there was little money in circulation and food was scarce. When a Puritan minister gave 400 pounds and his library of 320 volumes as the first private endowment for an American college, the community at large through the general court, also, set apart 400 pounds for a similar purpose. Thus arose in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, and Princeton. The underlying motive for these institutions was threefold; to continue the supply of an educated ministry, to prepare efficient leaders for the state, and to prevent the extinction of learning among the people.

Through their colleges the colonies shaped the intellectual, social, civil, and religious life of the embryonic nation. The history of the alumni of the colonial colleges would embrace

a history of a large part of our early national life. The college became the organ through which the national, religious, and literary elements of the colonists were developed on a new soil and contributed to a new nation. The Puritan had his Harvard and Yale, the Cavalier his William and Mary, the Presbyterian his Princeton, and the Hollander his Rutgers. These institutions were not mere copies of the British or Continental schools, but they were molded by a new environment, by the solution of new problems, by a new constituency, and by a new national genius. Conversely, they were, also, the makers of their environment, constituency, and national type. They were the medium through which the elements of an old world were dissolved and reorganized in forms of life corresponding to the new world. They, more than any other force, were the creators of Americanism.

What now is necessary to a college before it can claim a place among the historic institutions of the country? Age alone will not suffice. The number of alumni, the size of the buildings, and the amount of endowment may give a college a reputation, but not necessarily an historic position. It must represent a national element, a religious belief, and a philosophic system. Without one or all of these characteristics an institution may train its students, but it cannot claim to stand for something distinctive in the nation's history.

We regard Franklin and Marshall College as an historic institution in this sense of the term. It represents a national element, the German; it is the institution of a type of Protestantism, the German and Swiss Reformed; it has developed a distinctive system of thought, which has been called the Mercersburg philosophy and theology. The system of thought has undergone necessary modifications, but its general principles still pervade the various departments of the college and give unity to the curriculum.

In order to appreciate the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the union of Franklin and Marshall College, we need to consider the mission of the two institutions before they

were united and the work of the one institution since the union. What was the relation of the colleges before the union to the people of Pennsylvania, to the German element in this and adjacent states, and to the Reformed Church? These questions can be answered only in the light of history.

The early settlers of Pennsylvania were a mixed multitude. Broadly speaking, they were English and German. In religion they represented the sects and the church people. The sects, with the exception of the Quakers, were of German stock. The church people were English, that is, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and German, the Reformed and Lutherans. The German sects were indifferent to institutions for higher education. They did not feel the need of an educated ministry and therefore were not impelled, like the other churches, to establish institutions for this purpose. There were, however, among them learned, but often eccentric, men. They were not in a position to take the lead in providing collegiate training for the Germans. The first efforts for the founding of schools of higher education were made by the English, both statesmen and churchmen.

The charter of the Pennsylvania colony, announced by Penn in 1682, contained a scheme for the education of its citizens. The provision reads as follows: "The Governor and provincial council shall erect and order all publick schools and encourage and reward the authors of useful sciences and laudable inventions." The council is directed to form "a Committee of manners, education, and arts, that all wicked and scandalous living may be prevented & that youth may be successfully trained up in virtue and useful knowledge and arts." The Pennsylvanians recognized the importance of education as well as the New Englanders. But the former lacked the uniform constituency, the common life and ideals, which enabled the latter to put their theories into practice so speedily.

In accordance with the directions of the charter the provincial council, in 1683, proposed a "School of Arts and Sci-

ences" which became the William Penn Charter School. More than fifty years after the opening of this school, the Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia received its charter, 1753. It was established under the leadership of Franklin, Shippen, Bond and Hopkinson, and was to be an English school. Out of this Academy grew the University of Pennsylvania, the date of whose origin is 1779.

In the meantime there was no provision for the education of the Germans, who were a large element in the province. They had to work out an educational system of their own, though as was proven by later events not without the coöperation of the English. The mass of Germans was uneducated; many of them were opposed to education. The leaders, however, of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, Drs. Schlatter and Muhlenberg, were both alumni of German universities. They clearly saw that the hope of the German churches and people depended on education. Under the supervision of Schlatter, therefore, a number of charity schools were located for the Germans in Reading, York, Easton, Lancaster, New Hanover, and Shippack. These schools were established *for* the Germans rather than *by* them. That was probably the main reason for their failure. The charity schools were a good work done in a bad way. In Muhlenberg's reports to Halle, die Hallesche Nachrichten, many references are made to the importance of founding a "gymnasium" for the Germans without delay. As early as 1782 the Coetus of the Reformed Church sent a request to the Synod of Holland for the erection of a High School in Pennsylvania for the education of ministers of the Gospel.

The efforts of these pioneers did not bear fruit for a long time. The next opportunity for educating the Germans, after the failure of the Charity Schools, was a German department in the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Kunze of the Lutheran Church was elected "German Professor of Philology." Dr. Dubbs says: "The German Department is especially interesting as the earliest institution of higher rank than a

parochial school, established in this country primarily in the interest of the German population."

About the time the University of Pennsylvania was incorporated preparations were made for the establishment of a college in Lancaster. This institution was to take the place among the Germans in Pennsylvania which the University took among the English. It was centrally located in Lancaster for its constituency. The purpose of Franklin College is formally stated in a petition sent by the Trustees to "the Honorable Representatives of Freemen of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met." The petitioners were constrained "to undertake the charge of this institution from a conviction of the necessity of diffusing knowledge through every part of the state, in order to preserve our present system of government, as well as to promote those improvements in the arts and sciences which alone render nations respectable and happy." In the general plan of the college, which accompanied the petition, it is furthermore said: "The design of this institution is to promote an accurate knowledge of the German and English languages, also of the learned languages, of mathematics, moral and natural philosophy, divinity and all such other branches of literature as will tend to make good men and useful citizens." The attitude of the German Reformed Church toward the college is shown in a reply of the Coetus to the Holland Fathers, who asked them to give an account of the part they took in the new project. The reply says: "It is not our purpose to separate from Holland. Our purpose in founding the school was principally to this end, that our German youth may be instructed in the languages and sciences, so that they might be prepared to hold offices in the republic, and that possibly in later times, if the school should be firmly established, young men might be prepared for the ministry."

The way, in which the college was established and afterwards governed, explains the relation in which it stood to the English as well as to the Germans and the German churches.

The English gave their moral and financial support to the movement. Franklin was a liberal patron and probably on this account, as well as for his national prominence, the college was named after him. No less liberal in their coöperation were Dr. Benjamin Rush and Robert Morris the financier of the American Revolution. Four of the original trustees were signers of the Declaration of Independence. Still these men were only assistants in the work of founding Franklin College. The honors for the origination of the college are happily divided among the leaders of the two German churches, Reformed and Lutheran. The Reformed pastors, who may be called founders, were Drs. Weiberg and Hendel; the Lutheran pastors were Drs. Helmuth and Muhlenberg. All of these men were ripe scholars and were deeply impressed with the necessity of education for the Germans, if they were to rise to positions of influence in church and state.

The institution was to be controlled by "forty trustees, fourteen of whom shall be chosen from the Lutheran and fourteen from the Reformed, or Calvinist, churches. The remaining trustees to be chosen indiscriminately from any other society of Christians." The president "was to be chosen from the members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches alternately, unless such of the trustees as belong to the two societies shall unanimously agree to choose two or more persons in succession of the same denomination, or some suitable person or persons of any other society of Christians."

In the light of these facts we may conclude that Franklin College was founded by the Germans with the aid of the English. It was to be controlled by members of the German churches, the plan of government leaving room for a representation of all denominations and sects. The Reformed and Lutheran had the balance of power. While it was not a denominational school, it was altogether under Christian oversight. Its primary purpose was not to educate men for the ministry but to prepare men for taking part in the work of the republic and "possibly in later time, if the school should

be well established, young men might be prepared for the ministry." The latter design was never realized. It is said that only one man, educated in Franklin College, entered the Reformed ministry. There were prominent men in its first faculty. Dr. Rush wrote in 1787: "A cluster of more learned or better qualified masters, I believe, have not met in any university." Dr. Muhlenberg, the first president, had a national reputation as a botanist. Dr. Melsheimer is called "the father of American entomology." Dr. Reichenbach, Professor of Mathematics, was a distinguished author. The College, however, never represented a distinct system of thought, nor did it represent the German genius in American life. It was an aggregate of scholars teaching their specialties rather than an organism animated by a controlling life-system. It could not on that account become the medium through which the Germans were to contribute their heritage to American thought. It was not the natural product of the German churches, nor was it an outgrowth of the German life. Dr. John B. Kieffer, in an article in the *REVIEW* of 1887, says: "The movement which gave rise to the College was, as far as regards the Reformed Church, more from without than from within. * * * It cannot be said that, in the history of the origin of Franklin College, the Reformed Church appears as establishing and organizing an institution of learning for the education of the German portion of the population of the state. It was present at the transaction, indeed, but not as the primary, causing and originating force. * * * The movement was not primarily one of the churches themselves, and the institution to which it gave rise stood not so much for what the German citizens of Pennsylvania were doing for themselves educationally, as for what was being done in their behalf by others."

Between the founding of Franklin College and that of Marshall College fifty years intervened. They were a half century of decisive import for the Republic, the American Church, and the Reformed denomination. In regard to all

of these institutions it was a period of reconstruction and adjustment. The young Republic had won the victories of war. It was now to fight the battles of peace. Revolution was over but evolution only began. A foreign policy had to be worked out. A heavy debt and an empty treasury challenged the wisdom of the leaders of the government. The character of the government itself could be determined only by a series of events after the lapse of years. "The federal government was not by intention a democracy," says Woodrow Wilson. This may be inferred from the means introduced for restraining popular majorities. The Senate was considered a stronghold of conservatism. The President was to be chosen by the representative men in the electoral college rather than by a direct vote of the people. The federal judiciary, with its life tenure of office, would serve as a balance in national politics against the disturbing influence of the people or of the officials. The House of Representatives alone belonged immediately to the people and was the organ through which they acted effectively in public affairs. "The government had, in fact, been originated and organized upon the initiative and primarily in the interest of the mercantile and wealthy classes" (Wilson). During the administration of Washington and John Adams the federal party, with its principles of aristocracy or limited democracy, continued to hold sway. A new force in American politics found impersonation and expression in Thos. Jefferson. He and his followers constituted the Democratic party and slowly changed American ideals. The Federalists represented the moneyed and aristocratic classes, the Jeffersonians or Democrats represented the masses. The new states of the West were unreservedly on the side of the people and were jealous of New England aristocracy. As the Democrats grew in power the restrictions in suffrage, found at first in the thirteen original states, were removed. The new states had unlimited suffrage. Constitutions were revised and the revisions were always in favor of the people. Popular majorities began to direct the conduct of public

affairs. Until 1820, presidential electors had been chosen in almost all the states by the state legislatures; but in 1824 they were so chosen in only six states out of the twenty-four. With the election of Jackson the sovereignty of the people was finally vindicated. It was the triumph of the so-called "Democratic-Republican" party. The conservatives trembled for the safety of the nation when the reins of government were put into the hands of the uncultured and ungovernable Western pioneer. But he represented a rapidly increasing element in the United States which was bound to have a part in the administration of affairs.

In the growth of the political parties in the early Republic two tendencies were at work—subjective individualism and objective authority. They appear around the middle of the century in the new forms of state rights and central government. They are still the ultimate principle of the two leading parties, wrestling with the great industrial problems which confront us to-day. They are a reflection of a similar movement in Europe, though it is modified by the different historic conditions and environments. The European governments of the nineteenth century passed through the struggle of democracy with aristocracy. The absolutism of the eighteenth century has, in nearly every instance, been changed by the principles of constitutional monarchy, and in some cases supplanted by Republicanism. These decentralizing forces were loosened by the doctrines of the Reformers of the sixteenth century and have been working out their way through parliaments and bloody fields, through riot and rebellion, in the last three hundred years.

In the Christianity of the new world changes occurred which corresponded in principle to those in the state. The churches after the Revolution separated from the mother churches in Europe and had to adjust themselves to the new political and social conditions. Seven years of war exhausted, impoverished and disorganized the people. The spiritual life was at a low ebb. The benign influences of the Great Awak-

ening of 1740 had spent their force. The spread of rationalistic and infidel French literature and the multitudes of immigrants without religious inclinations, produced a cold and lifeless church, flagrant immorality and public professions of infidelity. The theological and practical work of the church was on a par with its spiritual condition. There were few notable theologians. Our literature had not yet gained an audience abroad. The work of missions, benevolence, and social reform was begun only in the second and third decades of the new century.

The type of Christianity, which prevailed in the churches, was the Puritanic and the Methodistic. The Great Awakening, 1739-1740, marks the entrance of Methodism into the new world and ever after that Puritanism and Methodism held the field. The conservative and sacramental types of Presbyterianism and of the Anglican and German churches were swept by the board, though there were not wanting men in each of these denominations who clung to creeds, catechisms, sacraments, and the educational system of religion. What did these divisions in the church represent but the principles which were embodied in Federalism and Democracy? The subjective conception of religion was in close sympathy with the growing political party, the budding youth of a rising nation, and the energy and push of Western pioneers. It held in its bosom all the elements of strength and of weakness of subjectivism. It was probably a historic necessity for the time to save the cold and lifeless church, to awaken the sleeping conscience of a people engrossed in cutting forests, bridging rivers, breaking virgin soil, and building homes. The revivalist and the pioneer go hand in hand. But the white heat of revivalism cannot maintain itself for any length of time in an established community. It violates unconsciously too many laws of the human soul and of sound religion to become the normal mode of life.

The subjective tendencies of Puritanism and Methodism do not take proper account of the past. They are unhis-

torical. They do not show respect for the doctrines, creeds, cultus, and morality of the Fathers. They find no place for the church with her means of grace, her offices and ordinances, and her great achievements, in spite of errors and corruptions, among the nations of the past. They fail to understand the Bible itself, though by profession they are Bible Christians. They desire to believe nothing but the Bible. But instead of a careful study of its meaning, a true historical interpretation of its teachings, they read their own fancies and imaginations into the sacred text. They use the Scriptures as a sacred armory from which they take the weapons of God to defend their self-made religion. They fill the sacraments with their pious emotions and memories, instead of receiving through them the grace of Jesus Christ. The tendency of the whole conception of religion is towards the human, the emotional, the uneducational, the unchurchly, and the rationalistic.

The result of this one-sided view of Christianity was a sharp controversy in most of the historic churches between the old school and the new school, the educationalists and the revivalists. The effects of it can be seen in the conflicts recorded in American church history from 1830 to 1850. It showed itself in the Presbyterian church perhaps more than in any of the other English churches. It was especially apparent in the German churches of the Reformation. The Lutherans divided into a General Council and a General Synod. The Reformed avoided a schism by a Peace Commission. From both of these churches the leaders of Methodistic sects went forth and organized or assisted in the organization of the United Brethren and the Evangelical churches.

The solution of the questions at issue, however, lay not in disruption and controversy but in a new interpretation of Christianity itself. The churches had lost their historic moorings. They were floating rudderless on the troubled waters of a new world. A new "*Welt Anschauung*," a philosophic foundation, a new conception of history, and a proper adjustment of the subjective and objective, of authority and

freedom, were the needs of the times. In Europe a new school of philosophers and theologians had arisen in the Romanticists and their successors who were leading the church out of the deserts of the rationalism of the eighteenth century into the rich fields of historic scholarship in the nineteenth. Many fruitless efforts were made to escape the dangers of subjective and individualistic Christianity by a return to the forms of church life in the early centuries or of the sixteenth century. In England the Puseyites revived patristic Christianity and found solace in the church of the fourth century. Throughout Europe there was an exodus of prominent men from Protestantism to Catholicism. They preferred the peace of a fixed and unchangeable authority to the patient and endless pursuit of truth through research and experience. Many, indeed, renounced the church altogether and became humanitarians and agnostics. A large portion of Protestants resisted all innovations and planted themselves eternally and immovably on the Reformers—the creeds and practices of the sixteenth century. But none of these remedies was sufficient to cure the disease. You cannot escape the difficulties of the present by turning back the wheels of time and commanding the centuries in their onward march to stand still. Neither the fourth century nor the sixteenth, neither Cyprian nor Luther, neither the Pope nor Calvin, could work out for us the problems of the nineteenth century. History moves forward. New occasions teach new duties. The beginning of a new foundation upon which men could build was found in the historical spirit, with its conception of organic development. The objective and the subjective were assigned their proper place in the unfolding of the divine plan. The authority of the government and the freedom of the individual were restored. The place of Christ and His Church in the Christian life and thought was reestablished. According to the theory of historical development God and man cooperate. Great movements ripen through ages of preparation. They cannot be brought about by mere individual effort. The destinies of nations are in the power and

under the guidance of eternal principles. The common welfare of humanity is gradually realized. The present is the fruit of the past and the seed of the future. There is a conservative element as well as a radical element in all true progress. The individual can only become free when he obeys the laws of the universal life. Principles like these slowly changed the conceptions of history, of philosophy, of government and Christianity. To Germany we owe their origin and first interpretation. From Germany they have gone forth as a second reformation in our age.

The bond of union between Germany and America was the German churches. Through them naturally the philosophy and theology of the period, following the *aufklärung*, would be brought to this country. Neither the Moravians nor the other German sects were prepared to act as mediators. The leadership in the so-called Anglo-German thought and life fell to the Reformed Church. It was adapted to this work on account of its genius as expressed in the Heidelberg Catechism and on account of its representative men who became the founders of its first institutions. Before the Reformed Church could accomplish its mission it had to establish, like the other churches and settlers, its own educational institutions.

After a long and discouraging struggle with poverty, prejudice, ignorance and disorganization the German Reformed people finally opened a Theological Seminary in 1825. The necessity of a preparatory course for the students of the ministry prepared the way for a High School at York, which in 1836 became Marshall College at Mercersburg. Its beginning was altogether different from that of Franklin College. It was an institution of the Reformed Church. It was a product of the German element in Pennsylvania. Born amidst travail and conflict it was all the more precious in the hearts of the people. It was one of the first educational children of the Germans in America. Its purpose was not simply general education but the immediate welfare of the Re-

formed Church. Through the church and under its supervision it was to influence the nation. In most American colleges the theological department was an adjunct of the college. The Seminary grew out of the College. Mercersburg College, when still a high school, was a department of the Seminary. The Seminary brought forth the College. This relation was significant. The system of life and thought which was taught in the College was organically related with that of the Seminary. The one naturally formed the foundation of the other.

In all historic processes there is an element of the unconscious or subconscious. The fathers builded better than they knew. No one dreamt of the part which the institutions were to play in the history of American Protestantism. No one thought that the seminary or the college was to become mediator of German thought in relation to the great questions which agitated church and state. It was humanly speaking a mere chance which brought Dr. Rauch, the brilliant young professor from Heidelberg University, Germany, to this country. In a few years he became a teacher of theology and first president of Marshall College at Mercersburg. It was no less accidental that Dr. John W. Nevin, professor of theology in the Presbyterian Seminary at Allegheny, soon afterwards identified himself with the new institutions. A trio of scholars was completed with the arrival of Dr. Philip Schaff, one of the most promising young lecturers in the University of Berlin. The work and influence of these men was felt in Seminary and College. It becomes clear now, when we look back over the decades which have elapsed, that the times were ripe for the men. The problems were at hand agitating thoughtful men everywhere. The church and the nationality, best adapted for their solution, had reached a certain degree of independence and power in America to enable it to support educational institutions. The men, with the brains, culture and piety were provided in mysterious and unforeseen ways.

Men of other denominations now recognize the transition in literature and theology in our American history during the

second, third, and fourth decades of the last century. In that period new national influences appeared in our country. Up to that time, since the revolution, in religion and literature England was a model for American writers. Dr. Thompson says, in his *Hand of God in American History*: "America was still a sort of replica of England and sought literary models in her writers. Irving, Bryant, Cooper, Halleck and the rest moved within the bounds set by English taste and culture, generally producing some one Englishman in a fainter copy. But the next generation went to school to France, Spain, Italy and Sweden, above all in Germany. * * * A Charles Follen, flying from the Holy Alliance and finding a tutor's place at Harvard, not only brought us the gymnastic of the German Burschenschaft, but infused a wider interest in Germany and its thought. So men like Rauch, Schaff and Kapp brought us an atmosphere of German philosophy."

The same author, in his *History of the Presbyterians*, says: "With the opening of the fourth decade of the nineteenth century—as of the eighteenth—there dawns a new age for the churches of America. As the date of the Great Awakening (1740) marks the transition from the Puritan to the Methodist or "Evangelical" period, so the new date (1840) stands for a transition to a period we might call the historical or churchly. * * * The characteristic note of the new era is its apprehension of Christianity, not especially as doctrinal truth or devout emotion, but as historical fact. It turns away from systems to the Scriptures, especially to the Gospels. It takes up Lessing's challenge—to show how historical fact can be religious truth—and meets it by placing the incarnation in the forefront of Christian teaching. It values all the ties of office and sacrament and worship which in any way bind our own time to that wonderful life and to the church which first grew out of it." Such writing is easily understood by the old Mercersburg students, who received the doctrines of the incarnation, historical development and the sacramental in religion direct from its leading exponents at that time in this country.

Of the teachings of Mercersburg, Dr. Leonard Bacon testifies thus: "At this institution was effected a fruitful union of American and German theology; the result was to commend to the general attention aspects of truth philosophical, theological, and historical, not previously current among American Protestants."

Until German scholarship was brought into America the philosophers and theologians of New England were still engaged on the questions which were debated in the Synod of Dort. If not debated there, they were at least presented and for the time disposed of. But they were revived from century to century in the Arminian and Calvinistic controversies. It was a "threshing of the old straw" in endless debates on "fixed fate, free will, free knowledge absolute." These were the limitations of theological discussion. Great minds were engrossed by it, but satisfactory results could not be reached from their standpoint. When Bushnell struck out in new and original paths in the study of theology he was looked upon as a heretic and had to suffer the consequences of his innovations. It could not be otherwise when one of the foremost American scholars proudly boasted that "Princeton has never originated a new idea." We doubt not but that the brilliant president of that great university would repudiate the boast to-day. In philosophy the school of Locke and the empiricists was generally represented. The philosophy of America was not in organic relation with its theology. There was no harmonious "Weltanschauung" which satisfied the demands of the understanding and the heart.

Space will permit us to designate briefly only the outlines of the system which in this country originated and was unfolded in Marshall College, and has since been the unique glory of Franklin and Marshall.

The plan of Dr. Rauch was to publish a system of philosophy, beginning with anthropology and continuing, through psychology and aesthetics, to its crown in ethics. Such a course necessarily involved a history of philosophy and a philosophy

of history. Though the system, so far as its publication was concerned, ended with the volume on anthropology and psychology, it became a part of the college itself and was developed by his successors to the present day.

The fundamental characteristic of the system was the organic conception of the universe in space and time. It was a form of idealistic realism. The phenomenal universe, from the atom to man, was conceived to be a vast organism animated at every stage by a divine idea. The visible world was an expression of the thoughts of God and was thus a system "alive and active in all its elements, filled with powers from the mechanical, chemical, magnetic, and galvanic, up to the organic, all of which flow invisibly into each other, affect and determine each other. Eternal laws dwell in them." The empirical school conceived the universe as a vast mechanism, whose parts were conjoined by a mechanic, and "whose powers exist side by side, without having any affinity to, or connection with each other." In the order of time the movements of history were organically related. The history of mankind was the evolution of a divine idea, ever struggling to realize itself through the travail of nations and of centuries until its ultimate goal in Christ Jesus was attained. Each stage of progress was the product of the past and the preparation of the future. The theory of development, without which men can no longer think, was the inevitable consequence of this view of the world.

This system of thought was completed in the Christian interpretation of the universe and of history. The natural world found its completion in man, the human world in Christ. Through Christ only the ultimate cause and purpose of nature and history could be understood. The church was defined as the body of Christ, bearing in its bosom the powers of the heavenly world and perpetuating in the forms of time and space the new creation in Christ Jesus. Christianity as a life is the same in all ages, but the expression of the ideal life, in doctrine, polity and cultus, varies from century to cen-

tury. There is, accordingly, room for change and progress without the loss of the essential life in Christ Jesus. By His coming into the world Christ became subject to the laws of the world. In like manner must His kingdom be established, not in opposition to the laws of humanity, but by entering into humanity in a lawful way and transforming it with its own celestial spirit.

Dr. Nevin in his eulogy on Dr. Rauch briefly sums up his personal conceptions of the relation between the philosophy and theology he taught. "Faith must embrace, not the notion of supernatural things simply, but the very power and presence of the things themselves. Religion became for him in this view an inward commerce with the powers of a higher spiritual world. The invisible was felt to be the truly actual and real, while the outward and visible might be regarded as being in some sort only its empty shadow projected on the field of space. Innumerable analogies, adumbrations, and correspondencies, not obvious to common minds, seem habitually present to his view, binding the universe into one sublime whole, the earth reflecting the heavens, and the waves of eternity echoing on the shores of time."

The history of the last half century has gradually vindicated the positions of the professors in Marshall College. The emphasis which is put to-day on divine immanence is a part of Rauch's and Nevin's system. The reconstruction, which has been necessitated by the theory of evolution, can only be made on the basis of an idealistic view of the universe. History becomes a meaningless succession of events, a rope of sand, unless interpreted as an unfolding of an eternal ideal. The church, now making strenuous efforts to readjust herself by revision of creeds and changes in theology, is doing so in the light of the theory of organic development, which was expounded by Dr. Schaff in his *Principles of Protestantism*. The educational system and the introduction of artistic and historic forms into cultus, which are signs of the times, are the results of principles like those enunciated in Marshall

College. The escape from a cold and lifeless orthodoxy, on the one hand, and a bald and barren rationalism, on the other, must be found in the view of Christianity as a life and of history as an organic process. The errors of subjectivism, which end in anarchy in the state and in sectism in the church, can be corrected only by the recognition of an objective idea which is expressed in political and ecclesiastical forms and in the bosom of which the individual must stand, and find his true freedom by obedience.

Far be it from us to say that American Protestantism has received its theology or its philosophy from the institutions of the Reformed Church alone. But the principles, which were first taught in this communion, are now generally recognized because the last generation of American scholars has drawn from the sources in Germany out of which the Mercersburg system was developed. Yet it is not a wild statement to say that our college through her representative men has to some extent aided in the shaping of the educational, philosophical and theological systems of the United States.

Franklin and Marshall, therefore, may claim the honor of being an historic institution. She has been an organ of the German element in this country; she has represented the "most Protestant Church in all Christendom"; and she has developed a philosophical and theological system. In this way the college has served a divine purpose, the beginning of which we find in the Protestant divisions of the sixteenth century.

The present has its own problems. Franklin and Marshall, if it is to be true to her past history, must meet the questions of the hour and aid in their solution from the historic standpoint which she has occupied. There are scientific, sociological and theological problems before us which were not before the Mercersburg men. But if we enter into the life of the present with the same zeal, scholarship, and freedom as they did in their day we may continue to assist in the shaping of modern thought and life. The theory of historic develop-

ment, one of the leading doctrines of Marshall College, would lose its force if the institution would not advance with each generation and adjust itself to new conditions. The time is past when we are to represent the German people only, or are to limit ourselves to a Reformed constituency. We cannot even hand down the forms of the system of thought of the first professors. In the new century all European elements have been or ought to be merged in a distinctively American people. The old and somewhat narrow denominational zeal is transformed by a more tolerant spirit which is binding Protestantism into closer fellowship. The only valuable contribution one generation can make to its successors is not a fixed system of thought but the spirit and life which inspired the systems of the past. The finished philosophy and theology of a period become a weight and a hindrance when laid externally upon the representative men of the next period. But, if the *spirit* which breathes in these systems, be perpetuated from master to disciple, it becomes an inspiration and a power for the accomplishment of greater work. Franklin and Marshall has its traditions, which it is well to conserve, but in its bosom are principles and possibilities which are to be unfolded and applied in the new conditions of the present century.

XII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any book noticed in this department will be furnished, at the lowest prices, by the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

A CENTURY OF JEWISH MISSIONS. By A. E. Thompson with introduction by W. E. Blackstone. Pages 286. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago. 1902. Price, \$1.00.

The purpose of this volume is to give the reader a concise and comprehensive view of Christian missions among the Jews of the nineteenth century. While many excellent works have been published on different phases of the Jewish question, the English reader has not been supplied with a history of Jewish missions. The author claims "to introduce the reader to practically every Society and Mission Station that has existed in the past century, to most of the prominent missionaries, and to the different types of Jew found in the many lands whither he has wandered." He has certainly been successful, not only in gathering a vast amount of information on this subject, but also in presenting it in a most interesting and attractive form. Every page contains facts and data from the field and the leading authorities which arouse the reader's interest and give him a thorough insight into the conditions of modern Judaism.

Of the 24 chapters, besides 3 appendices, the first 11 are devoted to a description of the Jew's relation to the gospel, the Jewish sects and subdivisions, their views of Christ, Zionism, the number and location of the Jewish people to-day, their progress in politics, literature, finance, journalism, and social recognition during the last century, and the efforts for the conversion of the Jew in the first 18 centuries. The remaining 14 chapters treat of the mission work among them at present in the three continents.

His first chapter on the Covenant People contains the author's conception of prophecy. He accepts the literal interpretation of prophecy which regards the Jew still a chosen people, whom God is bound because of the Abrahamic Covenant to restore as a nation and establish in Palestine. In other words, the future history of the Jew until the end of time is found in ancient prophecy, which is being fulfilled in the events of the present day. "With the nation regathered and reunited on the hills of Israel, and Messiah seated on the throne of his father David, the world shall see the fulfilment of the covenant, 'I will make of thee a great nation,'" etc.

He summarizes the relation of the Jew to the gospel as follows: "1. That, on account of their rejection of Christ, the Jews as a nation are set aside, during this age, from their place as witnesses unto His gospel. 2. That the Church, a people called out from all nations, is the divinely appointed witness to the gospel during this age. 3. That the Jew, as an individual, has priority of claim upon the gospel and to a place among this new elect. 4. That, at the Second Coming of Christ, the nation will acknowledge Him as Saviour and Lord, and be reinstated as witnesses unto Him among the nations of the earth." Many faithful and scholarly Christians accept that literal and mechanical interpretation of the prophetic portions of Scripture. To us it seems like a Jewish clinging to the letter, and a losing of the spirit of the Bible. The method is unhistorical and ungrammatical. It is a collation of texts to prove a Jewish theory of the Kingdom and the Covenant. The Jew will be in Zion when he is in the Christian Church; he will be restored into Jerusalem when he is absorbed into Christianity. While many readers will differ from the author in regard to his theory of future restoration, they will find the rest of the book none the less valuable.

He classifies the present-day Jew according to political, linguistic and religious differences. The political divisions are as numerous as the countries into which they have wandered. There are Russian Jews, Algerian Jews, American Jews, etc. But among themselves the Jews have no political organization. "They are bound together by internal forces rather than by external ties; by divine purpose rather than human control." In language the Jew has largely conformed himself to the countries in which he lives. There are three distinctively Jewish dialects. The Yiddish, based on the low German, with an admixture of other modern tongues, and a savor of Hebrew in idiom and vocabulary. It is spoken by the German, the Polish, and the majority of English and American Jews. This dialect has a literature, poems, dramas, newspapers, and Bible versions. The two minor dialects are that of the Spanish Jews, and the Western Jews in North Africa; the former being based on the Spanish language, the latter on the Arabic. There are four distinct Jewish sects. The leading religious division is the Orthodox Jews, next to them the Reformed Jews, and two smaller divisions in the East—the Chassidim and the Karaites.

An interesting chapter is devoted to Zionism, which is a very late movement, having been practically begun by Dr. Theodore Herzl in 1896, by his famous pamphlet on "The Jewish State." The purpose, the rapid spread and the future prospects of Zionism are clearly sketched. In his chapter on Jewish Population, he has collated valuable statistics which show at a glance the dis-

tribution of the Jews among the nations and their rapid increase in the last century. The total population in round numbers is 11,000,000. Among the nations the United States ranks third with its 1,045,555 Jews, Russia first with 5,189,000, and Austria-Hungary second with 1,866,837. The three leading States in the Union are New York 400,000, Pennsylvania, 95,000, and Illinois 75,000. The majority of these live in the three great cities of these States. Considering that in the 18th century Basuage, the French historian, estimated the number of Jews in the world at 3,000,000, Milman in his history of the Jews in 1830 puts the number between four and five million; their 11,000,000 population shows an astounding rate of increase. The author assigns his reasons for their rapid growth.

The Jew has not only grown numerically. He has made even more rapid progress intellectually, socially, politically and commercially. He dates his enfranchisement and political privileges from the middle of the 18th century. Not before 1858 could a Jew sit in the House of Commons. The United States became the first asylum for the oppressed nation. His political influence in Europe, since his enfranchisement, his patriotic services, his educational work, and his financial power are strikingly portrayed in a few pages by an array of facts and figures which must convince the most sceptical of the strength of the Jewish character when allowed to develop unhampered by political restrictions and social ostracism. The history of aggressive missionary work among the Jews begins with the 19th century. After the Reformation sporadic efforts were put forth in their behalf in England, Holland, and in the University of Halle, which was then under the influence of the Pietists. The Moravian Church was the first denomination to undertake definite mission work among the Jews. It was abandoned after the death of Zinzendorf. The awakening of the Church for Jewish missions in the present era came in England. The London Missionary Society sent a converted Jew, Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, to the Jews of London. In 1803 he addressed what was probably the first Jewish audience ever assembled in London to listen to the Gospel. He became instrumental, with a few associates, in founding the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews in 1808. From this time the movement received support from unexpected sources and was advanced by well-qualified men who devoted themselves to this cause. Their work was felt in Europe and Asia, and was especially prosperous in London and the larger cities of the United Kingdom.

The beginning and progress of similar missions and missionary societies in Germany, in the Russo-Grecian Church, in Papal Europe, in Mahomedan lands, in the United States, and the

Southern Hemisphere are discussed in a series of chapters on the work in those countries. What are the results? He enumerates seven results of the Jewish missions. Among them are the "increased interest in the Church." When the century opened there was not a Jewish mission in existence. At its close there are 90 societies, 648 missionaries, 213 stations, and an income of \$673,000, all of which is devoted to the conversion of the Jews. It is difficult to number the Jews who have professed conversion. The safest estimate has been made by De le Roi in his recent book "Judentaufen im 19 Jahrhundert," in which he shows that 72,740 Jews have been baptized by the Protestant churches; 57,300 by the Roman Catholic Church; 75,500 by the Greek Church, making a total of 204,540 baptisms during the century. Converted Jews become missionaries themselves. The London Society employs 82 proselytes. About 750 Jews are preaching the Gospel. The number of prominent converts who have rendered valuable services in Church and State is large. From the facts and statistics here cited it appears that Jewish missions yield about as large results, in proportion, as those in any of the heathen lands.

After this brief outline the book will doubtless commend itself to all who are interested in the subject. It fills a gap in the history of missions and is so prepared that it holds the attention of the reader from beginning to end.

G. W. R.

HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG. By Rev. William K. Frick, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Redeemer, Milwaukee. Pages 200. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, 40 cents.

The author defines his purpose thus: "This simple narrative is designed for the youth of the Church. Besides encouraging them to lead useful Christian lives, and teaching them at what a cost the foundations of our American Church were laid, it will enable them the better to sympathize with the struggling home and foreign missionaries of our Church to-day." The aim of the writer has been successfully accomplished. After reading the book one is deeply impressed with the intelligent and self-denying piety of Muhlenberg and with the almost insuperable obstacles which confronted the pioneers of the German Lutheran and Reformed churches in this country. He very properly addresses himself to the youth of the Church, for the instruction of whom the Lutheran Hand-Book Series, of which this volume is one, is intended. Too many scholarly works are prepared for the specialist, while the fruits of scholarship are not often presented in popular form to the laity. In publishing such a series of hand-books the Lutherans set a commendable example, which other historic churches, especially the Reformed Church, would do well to imitate.

The material for the Life of Muhlenberg is taken largely from his autobiography, which unfortunately ends with his arrival in America, the Reports to Halle, and the Life and Times of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg by Mann. The book is interspersed with numerous quotations from the sources, which add freshness to, and throw light on, the narrative. The material is divided into four chapters, entitled, In Training, 1711-1742; Planting the Church, 1742-1748; The Care of All the Churches, 1748-1776; In Retirement, 1776-1787.

A Reformed reader is especially interested in Muhlenberg and his work because of his close contact with the leader of the Reformed Church, who was doing a similar work, namely, organizing the scattered German churches into congregations, and classes or synods. The Reformed counterpart to Muhlenberg was Schlatter. The former came to America in 1742, the latter in 1746. Both found the Church in a disorganized, disorderly and most discouraging condition. The sects were making inroads upon the Church people. Ignorant and often immoral men served as pastors. The people were deceived by impostors until they lost faith in the ministry in general. Upon inquiry about the Lutheran Church, when he arrived at Philadelphia, he was told: "The Lutheran congregation was split in twain. The more spiritual majority had gone over to Zinzendorf: the minority had called Valentine Kraft, a vagabond preacher." The two Lutheran congregations to which he turned his attention were located at New Providence and New Hanover, known as "The Trappe" and "The Swamp." But on the way thither he was told that "the Swamp" Church had "hired" N. Schmidt, a quack doctor and dentist, as its preacher. On his arrival he was received coldly, and found that there was a "Schmidt party and an anti-Schmidt party, and not a few would have nothing at all to do with churches and parsons." These were the encouragements of the Lutheran pioneer, when he began his work in this country. In the course of his life he proved himself a man of true faith, of Christian fortitude, and of great executive ability. He recognized even at that time the necessity of the Germans becoming conversant with the English language, and adapting themselves to their new American environment. Himself a university man, he was an advocate of liberal education. The variety of his work is thus described: "He was pastor, itinerant preacher, schoolmaster, singing teacher, organist, colporteur, precentor, church builder, and, at times, physician." All this work he did with the intense opposition which a pioneer Apostle usually experiences. "The German printer, Christopher Sauer, sought both in private and in public to make myself and my office odious." An unprincipled woman brought vile charges against him, concerning which Muhlenberg

wrote: "If the devil had succeeded, I would have had to resign my office; but God was my defense. So the attack of the devil resulted at last in magnifying my office; but to me it was a time of much suffering." There was trouble about a funeral at New Hanover. "Certain hard drinkers and men of base character engaged Preacher Andreae to attend the funeral. The congregation was divided. The Quaker civil officers say, 'We have no use for preachers in this country.' The hard drinkers commonly say, 'As we have to hire a preacher for money, let us have a jolly one, for this Muhlenberg is too strict for us.'" He, also, made a number of missionary journeys through the wilderness. He visited Easton, Upper Milford, Saucon and Lancaster. In 1747 he made a tour through southern Pennsylvania and crossed the Maryland line to Frederick.

One of the epoch-making events for the Lutheran Church in America was the organization of a synod. The field, of which Muhlenberg was the overseer, extended from the Raritan, N. J., to Frederick, Md. The first steps for uniting the scattered Lutheran congregations in this territory were taken in the parsonage at Providence, April 28, when a uniform liturgy was agreed upon. The Synod was organized the same year, 1748. There were represented at the first meeting "ten congregations, six ministers, and twenty-four lay delegates, in addition to the Philadelphia Church Council." There were then about 70 Lutheran congregations in Pennsylvania and adjacent States.

The Lutheran and Reformed Church grew up together on the same territory. Muhlenberg and Schlatter met and "they became life-long friends." Ever since by reason of intermarriages, union churches, German blood, and a common national spirit these two churches have dwelt together in harmony. This book, therefore, should be read by those who seek knowledge of the German Church beyond the Reformed. It is suitable for the busy pastor, who has no time for the larger work of Mann. It will certainly be appreciated by the laity interested in the early history of the German churches in America.

LIFE OF ULRICH ZWINGLI, *The Swiss Patriot and Reformer.* By Samuel Simpson. Pages 291. The Baker & Taylor Co., 33-37 E. 17th St., Union Square North, N. Y. Price, \$1.00.

Until recently the only biographies of Zwingli in the English language were translations from the German. One of the most popular of these was Grob's life of Zwingli. There has been a revival of Zwingli studies the latter part of last century. A standard work in two volumes has been published by Staehlin in German. Many of his writings and letters have been translated from the Latin or from the Swiss dialect into English.

The first American biography has appeared a few years ago from the pen of Samuel Macauley Jackson. It is more particularly adapted to scholars.

About the same time Jackson was preparing his work, Simpson was also writing a life of Zwingli. It is adapted to the general reader, though its facts and statements are based upon a careful study of the sources and are therefore reliable. "The writer's conscientiousness in this regard has compelled him to spend much time in the wearisome but fascinating task of searching libraries, especially those of Continental Europe, in which the Zwingli literature is principally stored." In order to guide the scholarly reader a number of references are given in brief footnotes, while a comprehensive bibliography is found in the rear of the volume.

The author has succeeded in accomplishing his purpose—"in meeting the requirements of the general reader." From beginning to end one follows the narrative, in its clear, simple style, with rapt attention. The conditions of the Church in Germany and Switzerland before the Reformation are briefly depicted. The relative positions of Luther and Zwingli are defined, and in our opinion a proper estimate of these men in relation to each other and to protestantism is given. In a concise way he names the points of agreement and divergence in the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

The early life and training of the Reformer are so presented as to show how the forces operating from childhood prepared him for his reformatory work. The successive stages of his pastorate at Glarus, Emsiedlen and Zurich are a suitable framework in which to present Zwingli's intellectual and spiritual development. In this respect he was so different from Luther. The latter lived in the seclusion of a monastery, the former in the publicity of a pastorate. The latter was burdened by a consciousness of his sins, the former was grieved by the sins of his people. Both sought the righteousness of God. Luther by a deep inward struggle reached the assurance of justification by faith; Zwingli came to the same conclusion by a careful study of the Scripture and a gradual comprehension of the plan of salvation.

The great conflicts at Zurich with the Catholic party, the moderate methods of Zwingli, the radical measures of the Anabaptists and the bitter controversies with Luther on the sacraments are set forth in order. They all help to show the reader how difficult the path of a conservative reformer in the sixteenth century was. He was met by the hostile Romanists on the one side, and by the lawless radicals on the other. The humanists forsook him, and the love of his countrymen turned cold when

their secular ambitions were disappointed. Besides all that, it was necessary to work out a new church system, a positive form of government, doctrine and cultus, to take the place of that which was discarded and of fanatical schemes that were offered. Both Luther and Zwingli proved themselves as great in the work of reconstruction as in that of destruction. In the matter of church organization the Swiss was in advance of the German. Calvin, doubtless, was the superior of both his predecessors. He built on their foundations and inherited the Latin genius, which by nature is adapted to government and organization.

The last days of Zwingli are vividly portrayed. The student is impressed with the fact that Zwingli's life was, humanly speaking, not finished. His sun went down at noon. Great as his work was, had he been allowed to live to a ripe old age he would probably have modified some of his positions and might have approached more closely to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as held by Calvin. While he died on the field of Cappel his spirit lives on. The attention which his life and work are receiving to-day prove that he is having a message for our generation. A. V. G. Allen very properly says, in the *Continuity of Christian Thought*, "But he (Zwingli) was so far in advance of his age that his teaching produced no immediate influence. * * * Zwingli was not merely misunderstood; he was hardly understood at all, or, so far as his meaning was comprehended, it was regarded with distrust, if not with derision." Truth crushed to earth will rise again. Zwingli is having his day. Every student, and especially the preachers and laymen of the Reformed Church, should be conversant with the life and leading doctrines of the founder of Reformed protestantism. Simpson's *Life* will be an excellent work for the home, as well as for the pastor's study. It will serve also as an introduction to a more exhaustive study of the Swiss reformer.

G. W. R.